

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



Assessing the achievement of learning outcomes in peace education

Bilagher, Moritz Ernst Maria

Awarding institution:
King's College London

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT



Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Assessing the achievement of learning outcomes in peace education

Moritz Bilagher

Research-based thesis (RBT) submitted to the
Faculty of Social Science and Public Policy
School of Education, Communication and Society
King's College London
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor in Education (EdD)

September 2017

Acknowledgements and motivation

This research forms the culmination of a personal and professional journey. On the personal side, growing up with a German father and Italian mother in the Netherlands between the 1970s and 1990s meant that references to the Second World War regularly came up. This ignited a strong interest in me to understand the causes of war and inter-group conflict, which, in turn, led me to aspire to work with the United Nations. This was an ambition I could realise from 2003: first with the United Nations agency for Palestine refugees, delivering services including education in the middle of the Israel-Palestine conflict; then with the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Iraq, shortly after the US-led invasion; and, mainly, with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the organisation aiming to secure peace through its programmes including education.

I interpreted the approval of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015, which included a target directly relevant to peace education (4.7), as an auspicious development occurring during the preparation of this thesis.

Having completed this project, gratitude is due to those who helped me on this journey, be it through support, challenge or both: my thesis supervisor, Dr Gerard Lum, whose expertise has truly helped me broaden my scope; my second supervisor, Prof. Christopher Winch; and the other colleagues of the Department of Education and, in particular, our Programme Director, Dr Jill Hohenstein. I also thank the two other international EdD-students, Katrin Boege and Melina Foris, as well as the other students in my cohort. I thank the examiners for their thorough reading of my thesis and their highly valuable feedback.

Very significant gratitude is reserved for the 16 study participants, all great experts in their respective fields, for their generosity and time. I look forward to sharing this thesis with them. In addition, I have had informal exchanges with several other experts on the topic of this thesis, and am grateful for their views. I would, in particular, like to acknowledge Prof. Judith Torney-Purta of the University of Maryland, and one of the founders of the International Civic and Citizenship

Education Studies (ICCS). Thanks are due to my colleagues at UNESCO and the Global Partnership for Education, hosted by the World Bank, who helped me with interesting debates on this and adjacent subjects.

Finally, I thank my family for their support: my mother and stepfather; my son Kai; my daughter Maya, who was born in the course of research; and, as the expression goes, ‘last but not least’ Giovana who left me off the hook of doing my fair share at home many times, so that I could focus on this thesis. I will not forget this.

Abstract

As both the value of educational assessment for educational development and peace education for sustainable social development are increasingly recognised, it is of concern that peace education currently has no widely accepted assessment methodology or foundation for this. This may be due to the absence of agreed learning objectives. Instead, peace education programmes tend to be evaluated as interventions to directly achieve peace, bypassing the need for learning outcomes. Using the expert consensus methodology Delphi, this thesis enquires how achievement of learning outcomes in peace education should be assessed, if at all. This instance of Delphi was organised with a group of 16 experts in the field of peace education and, where possible, its evaluation, over three rounds leading to a 'statement of principles' in response to the research question. In the first round, a questionnaire consisting of open-ended questions was administered. A second round was implemented to solicit feedback on the analysis from Round 1 and, finally, Round 3 was applied to validate the statement of principles.

This Delphi found a difference between the social purpose of peace education and its learning outcomes. While the social purpose is peace, to be education, peace education must have learning objectives. While peace education is understood to be education on (group) identity and diversity, this subject can be engaged with cognitively and non-cognitively, suggesting different types of learning outcomes. In relation to these different types of outcomes, achievement should be assessed in different ways. Methods and methodologies for cognitive assessment largely exist, but this is not the case for assessment of non-cognitive skills. The Delphi concluded that learning outcomes in peace education culminate in inter-cultural communication skills, which combine cognitive with non-cognitive characteristics. The offered understandings are underpinned by a relational conception of peace that is open-ended and non-utopian.

Keywords: peace education, educational assessment

Abbreviations and acronyms

ACE	American Council on Education
AERA	American Educational Research Association
ATC21S	Assessment and Teaching of 21 st Century Skills
BCE	Before Common Era
BERA	British Educational Research Association
CE	Common Era
CIPP	Context, Input, Process, Product
CIVED	Civic Education Study
COPAFS	Council of Professional Associations on Federal Statistics
CUE	Centre for Universal Education
CTT	Classical Test Theory
DC	District of Columbia
DIF	Differential Item Functioning
DeSeCo	Definition and Selection of Competencies
DV	Dependent Variable
EFA	Education for All
ETS	Educational Testing Service
GAML	Global Alliance for Monitoring Learning
GCED	Global Citizenship Education
GEMR	Global Education Monitoring Report
GMR	Global Monitoring Report
IBE	International Bureau of Education
ICC	Intercultural Communication Competence
ICCI	Intercultural Communication Competence Inventory
ICCS	International Civic and Citizenship Education Study
ICS	International Comparative Studies
ICT	Information and Communication Technologies
IEA	International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement

IFS	Institution-focused Study
IRT	Item-Response Theory
IV	Independent Variable
LMTF	Learning Metrics Taskforce
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MGIEP	Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Education for Peace and Sustainable Development
MPQ	Multicultural Personality Questionnaire
NIH	National Institutes of Health
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OREALC	Regional Bureau for Education in Latin America and the Caribbean
PIRLS	Progress in International Reading Literacy Study
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
RAND	Research and Development
RBT	Research-Based Thesis
RCT	Randomised Controlled Trial
RE	Religious Education
RME	Religious and Moral Education
SACMEQ	Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Education Quality
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
TCG	Technical Cooperation Group
TESOL	Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
TIMSS	Third International Mathematics and Science Study
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UIS	UNESCO Institute for Statistics
UK	United Kingdom
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UN	United Nations
UNO	United Nations Organisation
US	United States

Tables and figures

Tables

- Tab. 1: Description of participants	54
- Tab. 2: Timeline for specific tasks	63
- Tab. 3: Types of peace education	103
- Tab. 4: The difference in foci between global and national citizenship education, based on Bilagher (2015b)	104
- Tab. 5: Taxonomy of learning outcomes in peace education	113

Figures

- Fig. 1: ICCS 2009 specification table (Schulz et al., 2010, p. 26)	88
--	----

Contents

Genuine philosophical problems are always rooted in urgent problems outside of philosophy, and
they die if these roots decay.

Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations* (1963/2007, p. 95)

1. Introduction: Exposition of the problem	11
1.1 The issue at hand	11
1.2 Evaluation vs. assessment	13
1.3 Is there really an issue?	18
1.4 Research question	19
1.5 Structure of this thesis	21
2. Background: Uniting two paradigms	24
2.1 Education, international development and peace	24
2.2 Monitoring, evaluation and assessment	28
3. Literature review	33
3.1 The debate on evaluation in peace education	33
3.2 Meanwhile, in the educational assessment debate	35
3.3 Controversies	38
3.4 Broadening the scope	40
3.5 Competences, knowledge and skills	42
3.6 Evaluation in peace education: The state of play	45

4. Methodology	47
4.1 Research design and methodology	47
4.2 Delphi	49
4.3 Sampling, participants and access	53
4.4 Methods	55
4.5 Data analysis strategy	56
4.6 Ethical considerations	60
4.7 Implementation of the methodology	59
5. Conceptual analysis	66
5.1 Introduction	66
5.2 The search for peace: An elusive concept	66
5.3 Education: Enquiries into the nature of truth	71
5.4 Learning outcomes: The basis of assessment	77
5.5 Peace education and its assessment	84
6. Data analysis	91
6.1 Introduction	91
6.2 Round 1: Understandings of peace	93
6.3 Round 1: Understandings of peace education	94
6.4 Round 1: Understandings of learning outcomes in peace education	105
6.5 Round 1: Understandings of assessment in peace education	115
6.6 Round 2: Refinements	123
6.7 Round 3: Towards expert consensus	127
7. Conclusion and discussion	131
7.1 Re-iteration of the problematique	131

7.2 Conclusion: The principles for assessing peace education	133
7.3 Discussion and recommendations for further research	135
References	141
Annexes	168
I. Ethical approval	168
II. Invitation e-mail	169
III. Information sheet	170
IV. Informed consent form	173
V. Questionnaire	174
VI. Statement of principles (<i>draft version</i>)	176
VII. Register of comments	178
VIII. Statement of principles (<i>final version</i>)	196

1. Introduction: Exposition of the problem

1.1 The issue at hand

Peace education denotes those activities that seek to further peace through teaching and learning processes. It has been assigned several origins: with Comenius in the time of the Thirty Years War, Montessori during the interbellum era and Boulding, Reardon and Harris in the 1980s, a period marked by nuclear threat (Harris & Morrison, 2013), and thus all ages of either open war or menace.¹ This suggests that it is correct to consider it, with Bar-Tal (2002/2009) a “mirror of the political-societal-economic agenda for a given society” (p. 28). While several definitions of peace education exist (Fountain, 1999; Harris & Morrison, 2013; Reardon, 1988, cited in Bajaj, 2008), as Salomon (2002/2009) said, it has “many divergent meanings for different individuals in different places” (p. 4) as expressions of it, according to Bar-Tal (2009), “differ considerably in terms of ideology, objectives, emphasis, curricula, contents, and practices” (p. 28). And so, following Hung (2007), it may refer to seemingly diverse things, such as: “conflict resolution education, multicultural education, development education, world order studies (or international education), human rights education and environmental education” (p. 40). Still, as Bar-Tal (2009) argued, in all these manifestations, a common objective can be found: the “aim to foster changes that will make the world a better, more human place” (p. 28).

Due to the contested nature of peace education, and the consequent lack of consensus as to which the activities that seek to further peace through teaching and learning processes are, it is currently not possible to assess, evaluate or measure learner achievement in this area in a way that would be widely accepted as valid by most peace education professionals. In as far as there does exist consensus on what peace education is, it is often considered difficult to evaluate (Bar-Tal, 2009). As a consequence, and while recognising the equally contested nature of educational assessment, it is overall not possible to benefit from the uses of educational assessment (Black 1998, cited in

¹ In line with Popper’s quote above, in *Cosmopolis*, Toulmin (1992) argued that Descartes’ (1637/2008), contemporary of Comenius, project to find a universal truth [*cogito ergo sum*], was prompted by the horrors of the Thirty Years War: a religious war, where different sides fought for their truths.

Newton, 2007): the – formative – use of assessment “to aid learning”, for example, so as for teachers to know which learners, or learners to know which areas of learning require additional attention; its summative use “for review, transfer and certification”, for example, to determine aptness for entry into certain programmes, institutions or professions; and summative use “for accountability to the public” (p. 154), for example, system monitoring to identify differences in achievement between groups for social justice purposes. To these uses I add educational research, namely the effort towards understanding the force and interaction of factors that determine educational achievement.

In addition to being considered difficult, some would consider evaluating peace education profoundly undesirable. They might not only question whether the absence of assessment, measurement or evaluation in peace education is truly problematic, but rather hold the opposite to be true. They might argue that educational assessment and peace education represent two essentially different paradigms that not only could not, but also should not meet: one of competition (assessment); and one of cooperation (peace education). This is a fundamental issue. From the view that not everything that counts can be counted, trying to unite these paradigms would be impossible and attempting it might be seen as hostile to peace education. Peace would be seen to be co-opted by a logic that seems its anti-thesis. To give but one example, as Gill (2016a) pointed out, implicit self-labelling of learners as failures may occur if they do not score well on tests. After all, when “judged with grades, a young person cannot feel that he/she is treated with respect because grades do not allow them to express who they are as persons, or explain their talents, interests, dispositions, dreams and hopes” (p. 2). This consequence of assessment, even if unwanted, seems at odds with the idea that peace education will “make the world a better, more human place” (Bar-Tal, 2009, p. 28).

This thesis can to a large extent be understood as an examination of whether there exists a possibility for assessment in peace education that will not violate its spirit and might even contribute to it. This aspiration is inspired by my professional background as a United Nations official, working for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), who has pursued a professional doctorate in education with a view to addressing this tension. Through my work in educational measurement and statistics, in the Near East, in

sub-Saharan Africa and in Latin America and the Caribbean from 2003, I noticed that indicators of educational development can be powerful advocacy tools, encouraging national governments worldwide to take action in pursuit of the right to quality education for all. I thought that an indicator of ‘education for the heart’ instead of only indicators of ‘education for the mind’ might strengthen the agenda of peace education internationally.

It was to my sincere surprise that, whereas I commenced my investigation in 2010, in 2015, the United Nations adopted its Sustainable Development Goals with one goal on education (SDG 4) and, within this, a target addressing peace education (SDG 4.7). Moreover, the Technical Cooperation Group (TCG), which was tasked with developing the indicators for SDG 4 – and on which I sat from 2016 to 2017 – decided that an indicator should be developed to assess learning in the subjects of Target 4.7, including peace education. This was Indicator 4.7.4. The sub-group working on this indicator found that no widely accepted methodology to base this on existed and, in fact, the development of this indicator is underway to this day. With this, this enquiry acquired more significance than it had initially had. Moreover, I perceived this as a possibility to put peace education on the map and strengthen its position in the international discourse. I thus request the reader to view this thesis from this perspective. The tension between the mentioned paradigms will be addressed at various points throughout this thesis.

1.2 Evaluation vs. assessment

A concern that evaluation² in peace education is weak has existed since at least the beginning of this century (Ashton, 2007, cited in Amani Williams, 2015; Harris, 2003; Malhotra & Liyanage, 2005, cited in Lazarus, 2015; Nevo & Brem, 2002/2009; Salomon, 2004, cited in Duckworth et al., 2012). In their seminal review of peace education evaluations, covering the period 1981 to 2000, Nevo and Brem (2009) found 79 studies measuring the effectiveness of peace education programmes or projects. While most of these (80–90%) were found to have been successful by the evaluators, Nevo and Brem found shortcomings in the evaluation studies themselves, including a lack of delayed post-testing and attention to generalisability (p. 275). Harris (2003)

² I first refer to the concept of evaluation in a broad sense and will specify, below.

agreed with Nevo and Brem that “there have been very few rigorous quantitative or qualitative evaluations of peace education efforts” (p. 8). Suggesting that not much has changed in this regard, since January 2010 we find only six articles³ that, in one way or another evaluate a peace education programme or project in what is widely regarded the field’s main journal, the *Journal of Peace Education* – and these articles themselves often lament the absence of evaluation in peace education (Duckworth et al., 2012; Kester, 2013).

For example, according to Baesler and Lauricella (2014):⁴

One difficulty in many of these assessment studies, and more broadly with the literature in peace education, is the lack of valid and reliable measures to assess the effectiveness of peace education across multiple communication contexts. The lack of adequate measures for assessing peace instruction remains a challenge even in recent years. For example, a current review of articles published between 2004 and 2011 in the *Journal of Peace Education*, an academic journal in which published assessment studies on peace education would be expected, revealed only two assessment articles for peace education in this seven-year time span. (p. 47)

In response to these concerns, there has been a number of attempts to develop theoretical foundations to evaluate peace education programmes. First, Nevo and Brem (2009) themselves designed an ‘orientation map’ for peace education programmes to specify their ‘facets’ such as purpose; (targeted) age of participants; major didactic approach; duration; and, moving into the area of evaluation, research design and method of measurement (pp. 272-273). In reaction to Nevo and Brem, Salomon and Kuppermintz (2002) developed ‘mapping sentences’ of peace education evaluations considering: programme attributes; socio-political context; implementation criteria; domains of changes; targets; and the criteria for assessing change (p. 8). More recently, a rather ambitious project was undertaken to clarify concepts, methodologies and techniques in peace education evaluation, culminating in the publication *Peace Education Evaluation: Learning From Experience and Exploring Prospects* (Del Felice et al., 2015.). The editors say it was Harris’ presentation ‘Peace Education Evaluation’ at the 2003 conference of the American

³ Apart from those cited in the remainder of this paragraph, they include, in alphabetical order of the lead author: Akgun and Araz, 2014; Goldberg and Ron, 2014; and Trinder et al., 2010.

⁴ In this quotation, Baesler and Lauricella use assessment as synonymous to evaluation. This thesis is built on the contention that this is not the same, as will be clarified below.

Educational Research Association (AERA) that inspired this project. While professing to use a broader definition of peace education than Nevo and Brem, Harris (2003) took their analysis as his main point of departure.

What is problematic in these efforts is that they (almost) invariably address *evaluation* of peace education, rather than *assessment* of the achievement of peace education learning outcomes.⁵ The difference between these concepts is rooted in that formal education is almost entirely defined by a curriculum or the “(i) why; (ii) what; (iii) when; (iv) where; (v) how; (vi) and with whom to learn” (Braslavsky, undated, p. 1). Within this definition, the ‘what’ to learn is represented by learning outcomes, which articulate the knowledge, skills and other characteristics that learners are expected to achieve in a course, programme or module.⁶ The curriculum thus addresses a *learner*. This suggests a logic different from that of many peace education programmes, which are often not curriculum-based, but non-formal initiatives or ‘interventions’, programmes or projects implemented by academic, non-governmental or development organisations with ‘ad hoc’ logics and structures. These often focus on *programme objectives* rather than on learners, using education and learners as means to an end that, in that logic, transcends her or him. In the programme logic, peace is more important than the learner. In the educational logic, learners are more important than the subject.

The difference between the concepts of assessment⁷ and evaluation runs parallel to these two logics: the education one, in which the learner is an end in itself, as one is to a curriculum, is connected with assessment; the ‘programme logic’, which is usually concerned with objectives of collective development is connected with evaluation. Indeed, in the context of education, evaluation is understood to denote the formulation of value judgements as to the achievement of programme objectives, while assessment is interested in what the participants in a programme have learned or, in the words of Nusche et al. (2012):⁸

⁵ I will use the terms learning outcomes and learning objectives interchangeably throughout this thesis.

⁶ Such courses, programmes or modules often address levels of education. This thesis does not focus on any specific education level. It does, however, focus mainly on formal education.

⁷ For a further analysis of the concept of assessment, see the UNESCO General Education Quality Assessment Framework (UNESCO, 2012, p. 26-29), co-authored by a team led by me.

⁸ Similarly, Gipps (2003) understood assessment to mean “a wide range of methods for evaluating pupil performance and attainment including formal testing and examinations, practical and oral assessment, classroom based assessment carried out by teachers and portfolios” (p. vii).

The term ‘assessment’ is used to refer to judgements on individual pupil performance and achievement of learning goals. It covers classroom-based assessment as well as large-scale external tests and examinations. The term ‘appraisal’ is used to refer to judgements on the performance of school-level professionals, e.g. teachers and principals. Finally, the term ‘evaluation’ is used to refer to judgements on the effectiveness of schools, school systems and policies. (p. 24)

Peace education professionals, however, often seem to use the terms evaluation and assessment interchangeably. For example, the mentioned volume edited by Del Felice et al. includes a contribution titled ‘Assessing Peace Education at the National Level’ (Barbeito Thonon & Ospina, 2015) in which the authors indicated, early on in the article, that they were *not* interested in addressing what participants had learnt (p. 239). This confusion between assessment and evaluation may be due to that educational evaluation often uses assessment data to arrive at “judgements on the effectiveness of schools, school systems and policies” (Nusche et al., 2012, p. 24) or programmes. Incidentally, the same confusion also occurs outside of peace education: Newton (2007), for example, said that when Bloom et al. (1971) “used the term ‘evaluation’ in the title of their *Handbook*, they were actually focusing primarily upon the process of student assessment, rather than upon the process of programme evaluation (which, incidentally, often involves student assessment)” (p. 151).⁹

When applying this distinction, it becomes clear that peace education evaluation, especially in non-formal education contexts, those mostly addressed in Del Felice et al. (2015), does not regularly use assessment data. To give a relatively typical example, Obura (2002) evaluated the effectiveness of a peace education programme in two refugee camps in northern Kenya, Dadaab and Kakuma, based on the extent to which the camps had become more peaceful after implementation, using a pre-test post-test design. The evaluation considered whether instances of human rights violations or violence had decreased in camps, while an assessment of learning achievement was not part of the evaluation design. The prevailing assumption seemed to be that to know the effectiveness of the programme it was unnecessary to assess what participants¹⁰ had

⁹ Incidentally, Newton referred to Bloom et al.’s *Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning*.

¹⁰ To denote subjects of peace education programmes or curricula, throughout this text, I will interchangeably refer to learners and to participants.

learned – it was enough to know whether the programme had achieved its objective: more peaceful camps. (Incidentally, in formal contexts, where curricula exist, assessment data may be used, both for high-stakes and more informal purposes; however, such cases are often not reported in the academic literature. In addition, such curricula can widely vary among one another.)

In line with the observation that evaluation may include assessment data, what characterises programme evaluation is mainly research *design*, for example a pre-test post-test, (quasi-) experimental design. From the design point of view, there is hardly anything that distinguishes such a study from, say, a health-related one. It can be implemented without knowing what has been learned. What characterises assessment, on the other hand, is mainly *method*, for example, tests (Robson, 2002, p. 292 ff.), essays and observations. This prevalence of evaluation design over assessment method in work published in the field of peace education is reflected in its theory. For example, Nevo and Brem (2009) mentioned the facet of research design before method of measurement; and their one traditional assessment tool, knowledge mastery tests, only as the sixth element within that facet, even after official statistics, e.g., rates of violent incidents or mixed marriages (p. 273). In their discussion on what is missing in peace education evaluation, all facets except method were addressed. While Maoz (2002/2009) criticised that peace education evaluation tends to study “before–after changes in attitudes, perceptions, and emotions” (p. 264), seemingly criticising the reliance on design, she then proposed process variables such as basic functioning (implementation evaluation) and quality of interaction (p. 265) as alternative foci of evaluation.

There thus appears to be a gap in the peace education literature in that it mostly focuses on programme evaluation, and design, not on what has been learnt (assessment) or on method. Yet while a gap, it is an understandable one: to represent this situation in a sequential chain, the issue that (a) peace education evaluation tends to not consider educational assessment data seems to be rooted in that it (b) currently is problematic to consider assessment data as there (c) exists no established methodology for assessing achievement of learning in peace education. If (d) one wanted to develop such a methodology, that would (e) require at least agreed learning objectives, to determine what to measure, but (f) given the contested nature of peace education it (g) seems

challenging to agree on learning outcomes. The absence of learning outcomes in peace education can thus be considered the difficulty underlying the absence of assessment in peace education evaluation. For this reason, I argue that for assessment in peace education to be possible, learning objectives will first have to be agreed upon. This, in turn, might further clarify what unites peace education programmes per se.

1.3 Is there really an issue?

Of course, one could view the paucity of assessment in both peace education theory (the debate in its journals) and its practice (evaluations) as a rather elegant strategy to solve the conundrum of seeking to evaluate something which we do not know very much of in terms of process, or even specific objectives, but do know in terms of overarching goal. After all, it seems reasonable to assume that, whatever the field of peace education should look like, its ultimate aim will always have to be peace; or at least, in the words of Bar-Tal (2009), to “make the world a better, more human place” (p. 28). Therefore, whatever peace education is, and whatever its learning outcomes might be one can argue that, if peace results from the programme, it has been effective. Moreover, following this line of argument, we might even use evaluations of peace education programmes to understand what characteristics peace education should have, if we accept that it should have the characteristics of the programme which, according to evaluations of it, has been the most effective in establishing peace.

However attractive this line of argument might seem, there are at least two difficulties associated with it. The first has to do with the contextualisation of peace education programmes. Even if we assumed that peace were not an uncontested concept – which, in reality, it is, having been subject of significant study (Galtung, 1975) – and even if we assumed that the success of a programme is independent of its context, an almost certainly untenable assumption, what a programme seeks to achieve in one context might not be relevant to the mission of peace education in another. Mainly for this reason, Salomon (2009) claimed that it is not possible to group all types of peace education under a common heading, arguing that there are essentially three types: peace education in intractable conflicts, which “attempts mainly to change mind-sets that pertain to the

collective other”; peace education in regions of interethnic tension, mainly between a majority and a minority (Salomon mentioned Belgium as an example); and peace education in regions of experienced tranquillity (p. 6). In such regions, according to Salomon, peace education tends to be about, rather than for, peace.

Secondly, in the peace education community itself, some level of consensus has arisen that one cannot make peace education responsible for achieving peace, but can only make it responsible for making learners more “peaceful and ... concerned about the fate of the earth” (Harris, 2003, p. 13). A peace educator “cannot evaluate the effectiveness of their work by seeing whether their students become peace activists or the world grows more peaceful” (p. 13). There are too many intervening factors for conceptualising peace education differently. To give but one example, if a peace education programme were implemented in a non-democratic country, and the leader of this country decided to go to war against another country, would this imply that the education programme had not been successful? It would not seem fair to argue so. It would be confounding the context within which an education programme takes place with the outcomes of that programme. As Lazlo (1974) argued, all that peace education can do is influence the minds of learners (p. 84; see also Wintersteiner, 2015, and Harris, 2003), not directly achieve peace. Peace, in other words, cannot be expected to be the learning outcome of peace education. This underlines the need for a methodology for assessing the achievement of learning outcomes of learners participating in peace education programmes.

1.4 Research question

It may thus be said that while there exists a broad consensus that evaluation in peace education has been insufficient, the field has only a limited tradition of assessment due to the absence of widely agreed learning outcomes. To address this issue, in this thesis, I will provide an investigation of the possibility of creating a generic approach to assessing learning in peace education. Concretely, I will attempt to answer two related questions: following the analysis at the end of Section 1.2, (1) what could the generic learning outcomes of peace education be? And (2) if at all, how should we assess the achievement of these learning objectives? Given the nature

of these questions, which seem to require responses in normative rather than descriptive terms, answers to them will be sought in the consensus of a group of experts in peace education. To achieve this consensus, as will be explained in greater detail in the Methodology chapter (Chapter 4), Delphi methodology will be used. This consists of a series of data collection instances where the experts are asked to answer questions and these answers are then harmonised to arrive at a consensus. This consensus will be captured in a brief document I will refer to as ‘statement of principles’. As the first-mentioned question is implicit in the second one, I will focus on the question of assessment and attempt to answer the following overarching research question:¹¹

How should the achievement of learning outcomes in peace education be assessed?

In response to this question, the main thesis I will argue for in this study is that the achievement of learning outcomes in peace education has to be assessed in a number of different ways, due to the fact that peace education encompasses different types of learning outcomes. These include both affective and cognitive skills. However, while assessment methods and methodologies exist for assessment of cognitive skills, this is not the case for non-cognitive skills, such as inter-cultural communication skills, which are the culmination of the learning outcomes of peace education. The existing belief, in non-formal education settings, that peace matters more to peace education than learning outcomes do is based on a confusion between the social purpose of peace education (peace), and its objectives, which need to focus on the individual learner. Otherwise, peace education would not be education. Further, assessment in peace education implies critiques of existing methodologies and uses, including grading, in line with Gill’s position (2016a) that educational assessment can be damaging (p. 2) as well as deliver benefits: it can help rethink how assessment can help make the world a “better, more human place” (Bar-Tal, 2009, p. 28).

This main thesis is underpinned by two important demarcations: first, to mark peace education off from peace studies it is understood to be learner-focused. In peace education, the learner is

¹¹ To do so, I first conducted an exploratory institution-focused study (IFS) on the case of holocaust education. This analysis found that learning outcomes in peace education can be defined on three levels: knowledge; affective; and transformational. This research-based thesis (RBT) is of a confirmatory nature, not focusing on a case (instance) of peace education but on peace education in general.

more important than peace (i.e. learning objectives come before social purpose). Secondly, so as to mark it off from other educational areas it is understood to have as its object diversity and identity in terms of group characteristics, be they ethnic-, religious-, gender-defined or otherwise (e.g., see Allport, 1954/1979, Chapter 3). While peace education includes diverse subjects, it is not anything and everything: it is sexuality education, but not education for sustainable development; it is international education, but not non-violent conflict resolution; it is foreign language education, but not human rights education (although this may be considered peace education if it addresses rights of groups). It may be civic education and certainly is global citizenship education. Subjects are peace education in as far as they focus on group differences and ultimately seek their reconciliation.

These understandings are all based on a concept of peace that is relational (i.e. peace is established vis-à-vis a counterpart) and open or non-utopian. The meaning of this will, hopefully, become clear as this argument unfolds.

In the following section, I will explain the structure of this thesis.

1.5 Structure of this thesis

To prove my main thesis, in the following Chapter (2), I will explain the background to the research question. This is based on the confluence of two paradigms: firstly, that of peace education and, secondly, that of educational evaluation and assessment. As they come together, on a large scale, in the work of the United Nations Organisation, I will give due attention to its work in both these fields. This is where peace education is largely rooted (Page, 2008; Roth, 2009) as well as where, since the turn of the century, measurement and evaluation gained in importance following the adoption of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). The objective of this chapter is to clarify the two main discourses inherent in the research question and argue why this constitutes a real-world problem.

In the next Chapter (3), I will present the literature review for this study, which will examine what the academic community said about the research question. This will draw on the debate within the two communities pertinent to the above-mentioned paradigms (peace education and educational assessment) and search for points of convergence. The objective of this chapter is to specify, in greater detail, the mentioned gap in the literature.

Once the relevance of the research question will have been argued, in Chapters 2 and 3, the fourth Chapter will address how I will go about to answer the research question in terms of research methodology. As the research question is a normative one (it asks how something ‘should’ be done), and as lack of consensus on the issue of learning outcomes is considered an underlying issue (see analysis at end of Section 1.2), an expert consensus methodology will be applied. The chosen approach (Delphi methodology) will be discussed. The consensus will be captured in a document to reflect this and contain the answer to the research question, validated by the study participants: a ‘statement of principles’. Given the importance of the experts’ legitimacy to answer the research question, the issue of participants will be given special attention. The objective of this chapter is to allow for an evaluation of the validity of the answer to the research question, based on the study’s methodology.

The fifth Chapter and sixth Chapter are substantive chapters and present, respectively, the theoretical and empirical data of the study as produced by the methodology as laid out in Chapter 4. While the research question represents the confluence of two paradigms or research discourses, addressed in Chapter 2, it consists of four main concepts: peace; (peace) education; learning outcomes (of peace education); and assessment (of these learning outcomes). To avert significant confusion on such contested concepts in the development and implementation of the Delphi, Chapter 5 will provide conceptual analyses and address, in the given order, the concepts that underpin the research question. The objective of this chapter is to provide a framework for the analysis of the empirical data, presented in Chapter 6.

The sixth Chapter presents the empirical data from the Delphi, implemented in three subsequent rounds. It follows the same sequence as Chapter 5, pertaining to Round 1, with each section relating to one of the four concepts of peace, education, learning outcomes and assessment. At

the end of each section, an argument on how the consensus translated to the statement of principles is included. The following Sections (6.6 and 6.7) present the data from Rounds 2 and 3 of the Delphi: the feedback on the original statement and its subsequent modification, respectively, the validation of the modified statement. The objective of this chapter is to present the empirical data to underpin the answer to the research question. Respondent names have been anonymised in this thesis (see Chapter 4).

The seventh Chapter, finally, presents a re-iteration of the rationale of this study, followed by its conclusion, as derived from the data presented in the preceding chapters (Ch. 5 and 6), and a discussion of the study findings. The conclusion will present the answer to the research question as rooted in the preceding analysis, with its ramifications. Finally, the discussion will review the implications of this answer in the light of the broader academic debate, and suggest further lines of research that may result from this thesis.

These chapters are followed by the full set of annexes, of which one is of particular importance: the statement of principles.

2. Background: Uniting two paradigms

2.1 Education, international development and peace

The world is going through a series of global crises. This awareness seems to have become commonplace since at least the then revolutionary report of the Club of Rome (Meadows et al., 1972) and currently seems so pressing that some scholars in peace education seriously assume that catastrophe or at least “contraction” (Kelly & Kelly, 2013, p. 284) in relation to one aspect of crisis is unlikely to be averted: climate change. Rapid scientific and technological developments, as well as massification of air travel, led to a global consciousness of interconnectedness, and sometimes confrontation, that has been referred to as ‘globalisation’. UNESCO (undated) conceived of this as:

... the ongoing process that is linking people, neighbourhoods, cities, regions and countries much more closely together than they have ever been before. This has resulted in our lives being intertwined with people in all parts of the world via the food we eat, the clothing we wear, the music we listen to, the information we get and the ideas we hold. (Introduction)

This idea was probably first expressed by Wyndham Lewis (1948), who understood the world to be a global village when he said that: “the earth has become one big village, with telephones laid on from one end to the other, and air transport, both speedy and safe” (p. 16).¹² Lewis’ idea itself may have been inspired by Montessori’s (1936/2008) understanding of the inhabitants of the previous century as global citizens: “contemporary man has citizenship in the great nation of humanity... He is the new citizen of the new world – a citizen of the universe” (pp. 25-26) and this, on Kant’s (1795/2008) earlier reference to global civil law or *Weltbürgerrecht* (p. 21, see also Section 5.2).

¹² Kelly and Kelly (2013), argue that the existence of a global village may come to an end, as changed circumstances might destabilise the assumption that it is unnecessary “to attend to or worry about the loss of local ecologies, economies, communities and memories. Within an expanding and globalising economy, it has seemed safe to assume ‘that if you don’t like where you are you can move’ and ‘that if you don’t have it here, you can safely get it from somewhere else’ (Berry, 1993)” (pp. 287-288). Note that the reference to Berry is included under References as: Fisher-Smith, 1993.

This sense of interconnectedness, and the recognised consequential need to tackle some problems on a global scale gave rise to the foundation of the United Nations Organisation (UNO) in 1945, as well as that of agencies that were and still are a part of this system, among which the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). UNESCO was founded simultaneously in London and Paris in 1945, the year in which World War II ended, with the main objective of establishing and maintaining world peace. Heavily influenced by the work of Montessori,¹³ UNESCO pursued this end through its three main programmes of education, the sciences (human and natural sciences) and culture, to which the communication and information programme – focusing on media, but also on information and communication technologies - was later added. The philosophy behind this choice of areas was that wars start in the human mind and that education, science, culture and communication are the areas of activity most closely related to the human mind.

This mission was expressed clearly in the opening sentences of the pre-amble to the Constitution of UNESCO (1945), which say:

That since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed; That ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause ... of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war; That the great and terrible war which has now ended was a war made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality and mutual respect of men, and by the propagation, in their place, through ignorance and prejudice, of the doctrine of the inequality of men and races; ... (Pre-amble)

As a remedy to such ills as were described in the first sentences of its Constitution, UNESCO suggested that “the wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity of man and constitute a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfil in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern” (pre-amble). Further to the importance of education “for justice and liberty and peace” in achieving its main objective the Constitution went on to state that the purpose of the Organisation is:

¹³ Many of Montessori's key speeches were delivered in the 1930s interbellum period at the Geneva-based International Bureau of Education, which was subsequently incorporated into UNESCO and now specialises in curriculum review and development.

... to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations. (Article I § 1)

Thus, education for peace lies directly within the mandate of UNESCO, on behalf of the United Nations (UN), and its modern history, originating with Maria Montessori can largely – but of course not entirely – be identified with it.¹⁴ UNESCO's (1974) engagement with this subject culminated in an Intergovernmental Conference in 1973, which resulted in its 'Recommendation Concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education Relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms' (see also Section 3.1). This professed the guiding principle that education:

... should be infused with the aims and purposes set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, the Constitution of UNESCO and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, particularly Article 26, paragraph 2, of the last-named, which states: 'Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.' (p. 2)

The present time, with civil wars in Yemen, Syria and Iraq, and threat of conflict – open or not – in a great number of other countries suggests not only that this mission is as relevant as ever, but also that the emphasis of Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, on nations and groups, in addition to “the full development of the human personality”, was well-chosen. Indeed, threat of conflict occurs often between different groups, however the lines between these groups are drawn, suggesting that at least part of the causes of the above-mentioned conflicts is cultural.¹⁵ It is to address this notion that the Recommendation further declared that education should include an “international dimension and a global perspective in education at all levels and in all its forms” as well as understanding and “respect for all peoples, their cultures, civilizations,

¹⁴ On a full discussion of the role of the United Nations, and UNESCO in particular, in peace education, see Page, 2008.

¹⁵ Huntington offered an interesting, albeit contested analysis according to which the conception of groups that are most prone to conflict are civilisations (1993).

values and ways of life, including domestic ethnic cultures and cultures of other nations” (p. 2). Over 40 years later, Abu-Nimer and Smith (2016) re-iterated the importance of groups to peace and conflict. It is worth to quote at some length:

... while it is true that the root causes of conflict are usually complex and consist of numerous factors, such as politics, economics, poverty and/ or class divisions, it is also true that they often come to the fore along ethnic or religious lines (Carment et al. 2009). In fact, since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Cold War, several scholars have argued that the majority of conflicts are identity-based clashes of ethnicities, cultures and/or religions (Abu-Nimer 2001; Love 2006; Fox 2004; Seul 1999). The Balkan Wars, the civil war in Rwanda in the 1990s, as well as more recent conflicts in the Central African Republic, Iraq, Myanmar and Nigeria, to name just a few, serve as stark examples where violence has erupted along ethnic or sectarian lines. (p. 394)

While one could say that the UNESCO Recommendation addressed the interface of education and peace directly, there also exists an argument that education can support socioeconomic development, in general, and that this would lead to greater equality, social justice and stability and, ultimately, peace (Barnett, 2008). This idea had been embraced by both UNESCO and the wider UN. Former Secretary General Kofi Annan (2000), for example, argued that education “is quite simply, peace-building by another name” (p. 3). It was also under his leadership that the UN launched an ambitious development movement called the Millennium Development Goals or MDGs (Annan, 2013). This set of eight goals, in vigour until 2015, addressed all fields of international development, including education. These goals were preceded by a few months by UNESCO’s goals of Education for All (EFA), six goals focusing on education, formulated in Dakar, Senegal, at the World Education Forum.

While both the MDGs and EFA expired in 2015, a new international development agenda was formed and approved by the General Assembly of the UN in New York, in December of the same year: the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). These include one specific goal on education (SDG 4), which itself contains seven targets. According to UNESCO, this goal can support the achievement of the other SDGs significantly (UNESCO, 2016). Moreover, and in contrast to both EFA and the MDGs, SDG 4 (United Nations Statistics Division, 2016) contains one target on what may be interpreted as education for peace:

By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development. (p. 1)

While this target has given renewed impetus to UNESCO's work in the field of peace education, it must be recognised that the types of education mentioned under Target 4.7 have not yet been conceptually developed.¹⁶ There still do not exist broadly agreed learning objectives for most, or even any of these subjects, which itself serves to emphasise the need to develop these if progress towards this target is to be assessed.¹⁷

2.2 Monitoring, evaluation and assessment

While the EFA movement had begun in 1990, in Jomtien, Thailand, it was only in the year 2000 that goals to underpin the ideal of Education for All were established. One of these (Goal 2, on universal access to primary education) was connected with an MDG: MDG 2, also addressing universal access to primary education – an agenda that, as Annan (2013) observed, had helped to increase countries' accountability in terms of achieving global development and thus momentum for the MDG movement and its agenda (p. 227). This period can be considered a watershed moment in UNESCO in that its measurement function was professionalised, as its statistics division was externalised through the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS). This was

¹⁶ In 2012, UNESCO established the Mahatma Gandhi Institute for Education for Peace (MGIEP), located in New Delhi, India, to address this.

¹⁷ I currently serve on the Technical Cooperation Group (TCG) for the development of the indicators for SDG 4, co-chaired by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS). This group has developed global and thematic indicators for the different targets of SDG 4. For Target 4.7, one global indicator has been developed (4.7.1): "Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development, including gender equality and human rights, are mainstreamed at all levels in: (a) national education policies, (b) curricula, (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment" (United Nations Statistics Division, 2016, p. 11). This is, of course, not an outcome indicator and so does not address the concern of this thesis. On the one (thematic) indicator that is relevant to this thesis, 4.7.4 (Percentage of students by age group (or education level) showing adequate understanding of issues relating to global citizenship and sustainability), the TCG indicated that "further methodological work is needed" (Montoya & Naidoo, 2016).

established in Montreal in July 1999.¹⁸ Since around the same time, roughly 2002, UNESCO has reported on global progress towards the goals of EFA through its yearly EFA Global Monitoring Reports¹⁹ (GMR) based, to a great extent, on UIS' data.

To understand how and why measurement and accountability became so important to the UN around the turn of the century, one should note that the EFA GMR was initially funded by the United Kingdom and that this country also issued a bid to host UIS. It is likely that the above-mentioned watershed was, in part, made possible through a broader accountability 'revolution' taking place in the UK public administration in the late 1990s: the Modernising Government initiative (Cabinet Office, 1999a) and, in its wake, evidence-based policy and practice (Cabinet Office, 1999b, p. 31). While the idea that policy should be informed by research evidence is hardly contentious (Saunders, 2004), evidence-based policy was at times interpreted as part of a change in organisation of the UK public sector from 'bureau professionalism' to one mimicking private sector practices, called 'new managerialism'. According to Deem (1998), this involves imposing techniques "usually associated with medium and large 'for profit' businesses, onto public sector ... organizations" including "monitoring of efficiency and effectiveness through measurement of outcomes" (pp. 49-50). Gleeson and Knights (2006) argued that this sought "to underplay professional autonomy and expertise in favour of institutional accountability through neoliberal reforms of the market, audit and performance cultures" (p. 279). Similarly to Deem, they argue that it manifests itself in practices such as "economies of performance, league tables, targets, audit and inspection" (p. 288).

It is easy to see how educational assessment and evaluation, especially on a larger scale, could become the target of criticisms such as Deem's, Gleeson and Knights'²⁰ and Wrigley (2004), who called large scale educational assessment 'reductionist'. After all, data from large scale

¹⁸ Incidentally, its first Director, Denise Lievesley, was Head of the School of Social Science and Public Policy of King's College London, from 2008 to 2015.

¹⁹ Since its 2016 edition, these have been renamed to Global Education Monitoring Reports (GEMR).

²⁰ Such criticism has a much longer history in Great Britain than the above would suggest. I stumbled on a book on education assessment in the King's College London library from as far back as 1979, in which Broadfoot (1979) argued that Britain had "recently" shown concerns over accountability, referring to an "explosion of accountability" (pp. 74-75) – which sounds similar to Power's (2010) "audit explosion". This she explained as: "the logical extension of principles of management control which are increasingly being incorporated into the school system" (p. 77). Specifically, and with relevance to the present argument, Broadfoot noted that assessment results had become a school's rather than an individual's responsibility (p. 76).

assessments such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) are not only fit for publication in league tables; such tables are often thought to constitute their main interest for a general public. Davis (1999) may well have been one of the earliest, and most eloquent voices to critique the use of assessment data for high-stakes purposes, such as holding teachers to account for learner performance, as unjust (p. 3) and signalling that doing so might lead to collateral negative effects on education, such as distorted teaching (p. 2). He reiterated this critique in 2015, arguing that: “one particular purpose [of educational assessment] has dominated in much of the developed world in the last few decades – to hold teachers and schools [not learners] to account. Tests are used to ‘measure’ the quality of the education system” which “has a destructive effect on education” (p. 7).

One difficulty with such critiques as Davis’, as remarked by a reviewer (Richardson, 2016) of the book in which this was published, *Educational Assessment on Trial*, is that while some uses of educational assessment may be questionable, with a broad sweep almost all of educational assessment is put on trial. This negates the legitimate and even important uses of educational assessment. For example, as Winch (2015) argued in the debate with Davis, in the mentioned book title: “formative assessment is a necessary part of teaching” (p. 103). More broadly, Winch argued that it is necessary “to distinguish between different aims of assessment and instruments for attaining those aims” (p. 103). To value this argument, it should be known that educational assessment is characterised by a set of dichotomies (formative vs. summative; high stakes vs. low stakes; norm-referencing vs. criterion-referencing; standardised vs. non-standardised) that describe different characteristics of assessment applications, which should always be linked to specific purposes. Newton (2007) identified 18 of these purposes (p. 161-162). The idea that the merit of an assessment cannot be judged outside of its purpose seems to have been clear to Gipps (1994/2003): “We must first ask the question ‘assessment for what?’ and then design the assessment programme to fit” (p. 3).

It is therefore not assessment or its function, such as accountability, itself that are wrong. It is a given combination of assessment and function or purpose that may be incompatible. For example, it is likely that most people in a democratic society would argue in favour of that their government should be accountable to its citizens. In thinking about accountability relations,

however, one always has to ask: “to whom, in relation to what and why” (Lewis et al., 2014). If the interaction between an assessment and a function is not carefully crafted, difficulties can occur. To give an example of a well-conceptualised use and assessment-relation, take the driving exam: the driving examiners are accountable to wider society for ensuring that only capable drivers enter traffic. The main purpose of this exam is not learning, although learning may occur, so it is summative and not formative; there are real consequences for the driver, so it is high-stakes rather than low-stakes; the bar is not relative to others, but the skill is central, so this is criterion- rather than norm-referenced; and the exam is non-standardised, so that the examiner can form an overall impression of the driver’s fitness to participate in traffic. We thus see an alignment between methods and purpose(s), or between the conceptualisation of the assessment and the accountability relation.

Issues arise when the interaction between an assessment and its use is unclear or incorrectly represented or interpreted. This occurred in discussions of international large scale assessments, such as PISA, which is often referred to as summative, or even high stakes. To illustrate the incorrectness of this, we need to recall the distinction between assessment that addresses learning and is defined by method; and evaluation, which evaluates programmes, and is defined by design (Section 1.2). While PISA uses assessment methods, it evaluates education programmes. This has implications related to the formative vs. summative dichotomy. Originally, Scriven (1967) understood this as applied to programme evaluation. The ‘learners’ in a formative evaluation are the administrators of a programme. Bloom et al. (1971) adopted, and adapted, this dichotomy for a classroom context, where the learner is a conventional learner.²¹ If the principal learners of large-scale assessments were learners, it would be correct to refer to assessments like PISA as ‘summative’. However, as its units of analysis are education systems and the learners are administrators, this should correctly be referred to as ‘formative evaluation’. After all, when the programmes end for the learners, for administrators they continue. And as there are no formal

²¹ To make matters even more confusing, they referred to evaluation, rather than assessment, in the title of their book (see also 5th paragraph of Section 1.2).

consequences for any stakeholder (like in an exam), they are low stakes. If such tests are used for high stakes purposes, we face a conceptual mismatch.²²

The challenge that I take on in responding to the research question is to articulate criteria for what good assessment in peace education is. This implies the avoidance of a conceptual mismatch, in this case, between assessment in peace education and the purpose of peace education. This is to heed Gill's above-mentioned warning that assessment, in general, may work against what it is that peace education seeks. The relevance of ensuring that such a conceptual mismatch does not ensue is amplified by the fact that assessment of learning significantly gained in prominence in the context of the SDG agenda. While there have been world-region level assessments, of which the data were used to evaluate progress towards Education for All, there has never existed a universal metric to evaluate countries' progress on a global scale (Bilagher, Holz & Iturria, 2014).²³ In line with the mentioned lack of definition of types of education grouped under SDG Target 4.7, the situation in respect of measuring progress towards this target is characterised by an even greater scarcity of methodology to assess learning globally. This suggests an increased risk of conceptual mismatch.

The aim of this study is to clarify the interface of two areas of education research: that of peace education, as those activities that seek to further peace through teaching and learning processes, on the one hand; and that of educational monitoring and evaluation and, specifically, assessment of the achievement of learning outcomes, on the other. Although it seeks to shed light on both of these areas, its fundamental purpose is to contribute to the further development of peace education into an educational subject, to be implemented in education settings across the world. This seems pertinent in the context of the SDG agenda, and specifically SDG 4.7 referred to earlier, given that both SDG 4 and this target are expected to help accelerate progress towards the other Sustainable Development Goals (UNESCO, 2016). More specifically, education can support peace and peace can support international development.

²² While Newton's (2007) argument that purposes or uses of assessment can be identified at three levels (judgement; decision; and impact, p. 150) is helpful, his contention that the formative vs. summative dichotomy is invalid, does not seem correct to me. According to Newton, summative assessment operates on the judgement level only (p. 156). However, if used in the context of an exam, it will operate on the decision-level.

²³ Although UIS is currently attempting to develop this through the Global Alliance for Monitoring Learning (GAML, see: <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/gaml-uis-concept-note-may-2016.pdf>).

3. Literature review

3.1 The debate on evaluation in peace education

The debate in the scientific literature does not offer a straightforward answer to the question of how to assess achievement of learning outcomes in peace education. On the one hand, we see that the debates in the educational assessment journals have, generally, not only not given any attention to peace education, but even given only scant attention to what has been considered its main domain of learning: non-cognitive skills. On the other hand, in debates on peace education, over the course of the previous decade it has become relatively commonplace to observe that evaluation²⁴ theory and practice have been weak. Such observations were often underpinned with references to Nevo and Brem (2002) or Harris (2003). The concern that evaluation in peace education is weak itself was in evidence in analyses by Barbeito Thonon and Ospina (2015); Danesh (2015); Del Felice et al. (2015); Duckworth et al. (2012); Kester (2013); Mandry (2015); Salomon and Kuppermintz (2002); Wintersteiner (2015); and Yazdanpanah (2015), to name a few, but certainly not all.

With relevance to why evaluation in peace education was considered weak, others, such as Bar-Tal (2009) emphasised the difficulties associated with the evaluation of peace education programmes and projects, stating that usual assessment methods, such as tests, are not suitable. The main reason for this, he argued, was that, while usual assessment tends to assess levels of knowledge, peace education pertains to “internalization of values, attitudes, skills, and patterns of behaviors” (p. 34) – that is to say, non-cognitive learning outcomes. In reality, there is no consensus on what should be assessed in peace education. There is only broad consensus that peace education is an umbrella concept covering a range of subjects, which may include “conflict resolution education, multicultural education, development education, world order studies (or international education), human rights education and environmental education”

²⁴ Note that the debate on evaluation in peace education tends to refer to evaluation rather than assessment, as discussed in Section 1.2. This characteristic of the debate will be addressed further.

(Hung, 2007, p. 40) or still other subjects (Bajaj, 2008; Duckworth, 2008; Harris & Morrison, 2013; Hung, 2007; and Salomon, 2009).

In reality, however, the concern that there had not been sufficient attention to evaluation in peace education programmes had already been expressed before Nevo and Brem's seminal review. For example, three years earlier, in 1999, Susan Fountain of UNICEF, the United Nations Children's Fund, had already written that: "Relatively few systematic attempts to evaluate peace education programmes have been carried out by UNICEF offices thus far" (p. 32) and, earlier still, in 1991, Christie had argued that "to date, there have been only a few attempts to assess, in a careful and systematic way, the impact of instruction [in nuclear war education, a manifestation of peace education relatively typical of the time] on students" (p. 7) concluding that "at present there is no research examining cognitive, affective, and behavioral measures of psychological constructs in peace education" (p. 20). Interestingly, in the same year – that of the fall of the Soviet Union – an evaluation study of a peace education programme using information and communication technologies (ICT) was published, equally complaining of the dearth of research on effectiveness (Schrum, 1991, pp. 10-11) – however, not with reference to its peace education component, but with reference to its technology component.²⁵

Going further still, UNESCO's (1974) 'Recommendation Concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education Relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms' did not mention evaluation, but did mention research on effectiveness (in § 20, 28 and 41). It declared that the type of education addressed by it was "gathered in a concise expression, 'international education'" (p. 1). Following this lead, and due to the work of a movement on global education led by Jim Becker and Lee Anderson in the United States in the late 1960s²⁶ and early 1970s (Abdullahi, 2010, p. 25) the years following 1974 saw a proliferation of programmes in international education or, more commonly, global education.

²⁵ In 1991, the digital revolution was yet to start. Computers were still not widely available and neither was Internet. According to Schrum (1991): "Global interactions and peace education among students with widely different views and backgrounds can enhance understanding of the nature and fragility of the world. We now have a rapid and relatively accessible manner in which to accomplish this goal using a computer, modem, and data transmissions" (p. 12). She concluded that: "Use of this technology has truly created McLuhan's global village" (see also Section 2.1). This represents a positive interpretation of technology's power to create a better world, which would be echoed, around 10 years later, in the rhetoric on 21st century skills (see next section).

²⁶ Personal communication with Prof. Judith Torney-Purta (e-mail of 16 January 2017).

Yet, as a 1983 document suggests (Falkenstein), the movement seemed more focused on making the case for the purposes of such education than to understand the extent to which it achieved its purposes (e.g., p. 33). It only briefly mentioned evaluation in the context of an example of global education in Minnesota, which simply stated: “Evaluation instruments for students will be identified” (p. 16), suggesting the clarity left to be desired. One of the few exceptions to this rule that evaluation was not of primary concern at the time, was a 1982 paper by Torney-Purta. Seven years later, the same researcher proposed four models for taking the research agenda on global and international education further (Torney-Purta, 1989).

3.2 Meanwhile, in the educational assessment debate

While the educational assessment discourse still hardly pays attention to peace education, since around the beginning of this decade it has begun to take notice of what, according to Bar-Tal (2009) is its essence: “internalization of values, attitudes, skills, and patterns of behaviors” (p. 34) or non-cognitive skills. This does not mean that they had not been discussed at all, earlier on.²⁷ For example, Gray (1996) noted that while almost all studies of school effectiveness considered cognitive outcomes measures, a “rather smaller number” had looked at non-cognitive aspects (p. 127). Earlier, Broadfoot (1979) saw that, as far back as 1959, Parsons had identified two parameters of educational assessment: achievement and a moral dimension including “non-cognitive attributes of behaviour and work habits” (p. 107) – something we might nowadays call meta-cognition. These calls did not receive broad attention, however. This might well have been because, as Bloom et al. (1971) suggested, of fear of indoctrination (p. 226); or, as Broadfoot noted, because assessment of ‘aesthetic, moral or personal development’ was thought to infringe on personal liberties; a concern to which she responded that “the result of not assessing important aspects of education such as” these “is likely to be a reinforcement of the neglect of these potential curricular areas” (p. 75).²⁸

²⁷ One of the first researchers to recognise the incompleteness of cognitive intelligence to understand intelligence in general was Howard Gardner (2011), who developed the concept of “multiple intelligences” (p. ix), which included inter-personal intelligence in addition to, for example, logical-mathematical intelligence.

²⁸ It is quite plausible that the relative lack of interest in non-cognitive skills in educational assessment reflects a lack of interest in non-cognitive skills in education, overall.

The reason that the subject of assessment of non-cognitive skills has begun to attract greater attention recently may well be that the impulse for it came from education economics. While some early educational assessments in the 1960s by Coleman et al. (1966) focused on equality of opportunity in education (Kyriakides & Charalambous, 2014, p. 33), in the following decade, educational research on attainment and achievement included considerable work on return to investment in education, mainly by Psacharopoulos (1973, 1985, 1994; and 2004, with Patrinos). While these analyses addressed attainment – educational level reached – and not achievement as reflected by test scores, the issue of the relation between educational achievement and return to investment was addressed by Hanushek and Woessmann (2010), who argued for such a link in a series of studies published in the second half of the last decade. And while their focus had been on cognitive skills, in line with economists such as Heckman and Kautz (2012), arguing that non-cognitive or soft skills are also important for economic growth, Levin (2011) contended that non-cognitive skills should also be assessed on a large scale.

The recognition of the importance of non-cognitive skills to educational assessment came about almost directly after another paradigmatic development of a global character: the penetration of information and communication technologies in all spheres of life.²⁹ It was, therefore, probably not a coincidence that it was technology companies (Cisco, Intel and Microsoft) taking forward one of the most important initiatives to raise the status of non-cognitive skills in education, and educational assessment, through assessment and teaching of 21st century skills, ATC21S. In the course of this project, begun in 2008, Binkley et al. (2012) defined ten such skills in the four broad categories of ways of thinking (creativity and innovation; critical thinking, problem-solving, decision-making; learning to learn/metacognition), tools for working (information literacy; information and communication technology literacy), ways of working (communication; collaboration) and ways of living in the world (citizenship – local and global; life and career; personal and social responsibility – including cultural awareness and competence). In the words of a January 2010 status update (Cisco, Intel and Microsoft, 2010):

²⁹ This highlights how appropriate it was that the Schrum study (1991) was a peace education initiative predicated on the use of such technologies.

How we live, work, play and learn has been dramatically transformed by technology over the past 20 years. We need different skills today than we did in the 20th century, and educational institutions have a critical role to play in developing those skills. But by and large, primary and secondary schools have not kept pace with the changing skill sets that students need to succeed. ... [we] unveiled plans in January 2008 to sponsor a project to research and develop new approaches, methods and technologies for measuring the success of 21st-century teaching and learning in classrooms around the world. (p. 1)

The focus of the status update then shifted to assessment. The fact that the initiative focused on educational assessment was in recognition of the extent to which international studies, such as the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) based Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) studies, had begun to determine education agendas across countries.³⁰

School officials and global assessment organizations such as the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) will be able to use these methods of assessment to evaluate how well schools are teaching 21st-century skills. Assessment plays a critical role in setting standards and influencing curricula at the local, regional, national and global level, *so it is expected that these new assessments will motivate schools to do more to instill 21st-century skills.* [Emphasis mine] (p. 1)

While still representing a broad agenda, one could argue that the mainly economic justification for 21st century skills was a reduction of its original intention. The idea behind and mention of 21st century skills seems to originate with a UNESCO publication from the 1990s (Roy Singh, 1991), motivated by a set of macro-level developments similar to the ones that the report of the Club of Rome had referred to: exponential growth of scientific and technological knowledge; a human values crisis; and environmental concerns, among others. Therefore, there was a strong suggestion that these ‘new’ skills should help avert the crisis mentioned in Section 2.1 or even make the world “a better, more human place” (Bar-Tal, 2009, p. 28). Still, the marriage of this peace-related aim and technology in ATC21S seems common for projects on education for the future. For example, an OECD-based review on 21st century skills (Ananiadou & Claro, 2009) understood these as based in the domains of information; communication; and ethics and social

³⁰ In fact, OECD’s PISA was a partner in this initiative.

impact. These seem to represent the concepts of technology (information skills), human values (soft skills) and the confluence of both: communication skills.

3.3 Controversies

Thus, the liaison between the assessment for 21st century skills initiative, which formally closed in 2012, and OECD's PISA can hardly be considered a coincidence. This alliance was of interest to technology companies, which sought to capitalise on the significant normative influence of large-scale educational assessment, as well as of interest to the OECD, an organisation dedicated to economic cooperation and development. PISA's Director, Andreas Schleicher has argued on more than one occasion that, for a country, "your education today is your economy tomorrow" (Coughlan, 2013), recalling the importance of the 'return on investment'-philosophy, mentioned in Section 3.2. Nevertheless, ATC21CS seems not yet to have had a great influence on PISA. Still, PISA argued that its assessments are innovative as they do not assess just knowledge but also the ability to apply that knowledge, which they refer to loosely as either competence or skill. In its 2014 report on the 2012 application of PISA, the OECD (2014a) stated that:

The assessment, which focuses on reading, mathematics, science and problem solving, does not just ascertain whether students can reproduce knowledge; it also examines how well students can extrapolate from what they have learned and apply that knowledge in unfamiliar settings, both in and outside of school. This approach reflects the fact that modern economies reward individuals not for what they know, but for what they can do with what they know. (p. 24)

Overall, PISA is remarkably quiet on the theoretical basis of its tests. The technical report of PISA 2012 (OECD, 2014b) referred to its assessment framework³¹ (p. 22), which itself (OECD, 2013) mentioned a literacy approach, arguing that:

The PISA assessment takes a broad approach to measuring knowledge, skills and attitudes that reflect current changes in school priorities, moving beyond the school-based approach towards the use of

³¹ An assessment framework constitutes the theoretical basis for the blueprints of educational achievement tests; it specifies elements such as the subject, domain and difficulty level of a test, enabling the development of test items covering the educational area the test is intended to reflect.

knowledge in tasks and challenges likely to be encountered in home and work life outside school. ... PISA focuses on competencies that 15-year-old students will need in the future and seeks to assess what they can do with what they have learnt – reflecting the ability of students to continue learning throughout their lives by applying what they learn in school to non-school environments, evaluating their choices and making decisions. ... The term “literacy” is used to encapsulate this broader concept of knowledge and skills. (p. 13)

While most of the studies of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), often considered the other important stream of international large-scale assessments, next to PISA (Kyriakides & Charalambous, 2014, p. 34), such as the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS),³² are curriculum-driven and consequently based on curriculum analyses (Mullis and Martin, 2007), PISA’s assessment frameworks are developed by expert panels (OECD, 2013, p. 3). PISA justified this by arguing, first, that in “an international setting, a focus on curriculum content would restrict attention to curriculum elements common to all or most countries”; and secondly that certain “broad, general skills are essential for students to develop”, which “include communication, adaptability, flexibility, problem solving and the use of information technologies” and that these “are developed across the curriculum and an assessment of them requires a broad cross-curricular focus” (p. 15).

Since around the turn of the last decade, however, PISA and its discourse came under increasing scrutiny (Baird et al., 2011; Wagemaker, 2013). This culminated in a letter in *The Guardian*³³ of March 2014, signed by 84 academics concerned by the normative influence of PISA to steer international education policy through its tests and publication of findings, influencing the public opinion and, consequently, policy makers. This (Andrews et al., 2014) addressed the OECD’s focus on economic development, alluded to earlier, and that PISA seemed to make undemocratic, indirect decisions on what national curriculums should contain through its expert panels. As to the first point, it argued that as:

³² There is an interesting early history to international large-scale assessment: while based in Amsterdam, IEA was founded and maintains its data-processing centre in Hamburg, Schleicher’s and Schulz’ city of origin, and location of UNESCO’s Institute for Life-long learning. Postlethwaite, who helped develop the initial study for the Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ), also worked there.

³³ It was fitting that this letter should be published in a British newspaper (see second paragraph of Section 2.2).

... an organisation of economic development, OECD is naturally biased in favour of the economic role of public [state] schools. But preparing young men and women for gainful employment is not the only, and not even the main goal of public education, which has to prepare students for participation in democratic self-government, moral action and a life of personal development, growth and wellbeing. (Bullet point 4)

On the second point, addressing the legitimacy of the expert panels, according to the academics:

... to date, the groups with greatest influence on what and how international learning is assessed are psychometricians, statisticians, and economists. They certainly deserve a seat at the table, but so do many other groups: parents, educators, administrators, community leaders, students, as well as scholars from disciplines like anthropology, sociology, history, philosophy, linguistics, as well as the arts and humanities. (Point 2)

This criticism is reminiscent of Berlak's (1992a) critique of almost twenty years earlier, that "the validity of educational tests is not and cannot be regarded as a technical question to be left to testing specialists" (p. 185). Berlak referred specifically to construct validity as, according to Cherryholmes (1989), "constructs themselves are products of power and their use is an exercise of power" (cited in Berlak, 1992a, p. 185). According to Berlak, by monopolising decisions regarding construct validity, testing experts "exercise dominion over others". This may be a misunderstanding. While Berlak's and the academics' criticisms are fair in that *what* should be tested should be a broader concern than that of testing experts only, once consensus on that exists, not all should sit at the table to determine *how* this should be done, as assessment is not an expertise that all have. There is a difference between choosing a construct domain and testing construct validity of assessment instruments. With reference to the academics' critique, while it makes sense for scholars from different disciplines to decide what is assessed, it does not make sense for scholars in one subject to determine how to assess in another.

3.4 Broadening the scope

The academics signing the open letter in The Guardian did address the issue of what is assessed by criticising the limited range of subjects included in PISA (reading, mathematics and science).

They explicitly referred to aspects of non-cognitive assessment, arguing that: “By emphasizing a narrow range of measurable aspects of education, Pisa takes attention away from the less measurable or immeasurable educational objectives like physical, moral, civic and artistic development, thereby dangerously narrowing our collective imagination regarding what education is and ought to be about.” As EFA drew to a close, this issue was addressed by a group called the Learning Metric Taskforce (LMTF). This collective was founded in July 2012 by UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) and the Centre for Universal Education (CUE) at the Washington, DC-based Brookings Institution. The group aimed for a shift in global educational monitoring and evaluation (UNESCO Institute for Statistics & CUE, 2013), from access to education to access and learning.³⁴ To underpin this, it identified seven domains of learning to be measured, going far beyond the subjects measured by PISA.³⁵

The concern that international assessments addressed only a limited set of subjects was echoed by Bilagher (2015a), placing this in a context of education quality (p. 115),³⁶ based on OREALC/UNESCO’s conceptualisation. According to OREALC/UNESCO (2008), the concept of quality education refers to five main dimensions. While education of good quality must be effective, which refers to the extent to which education systems manage to provide access and opportunities for learning, effectiveness is not sufficient. Good quality education should also be efficient (involve a responsible use of resources); equitable (in the distribution of educational benefits); pertinent (be responsive to the needs of learners) and relevant. This last dimension addresses the extent to which an education system responds to the needs of a society. That is to say, while UNESCO, for example, used learning achievement as an indicator for quality of education (Mulongo, 2014), if subjects that are relevant to social development are not assessed, it cannot be understood to reflect education quality. Viewing this from the perspective of

³⁴ This idea itself was not entirely new – UIS’ 2008 mid-term strategy already addressed the need for learning statistics (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2007).

³⁵ Viz.: physical well-being; social and emotional; culture and the arts; literacy and communication; learning approaches and cognition; numeracy and mathematics; science and technology (UNESCO Institute for Statistics & CUE, 2013, p. 2).

³⁶ I am aware that Schuck et al. (2008) go so far as to argue that “the very ascription of the word ‘quality’ to education connotes a product or commodity rather than a process” (p. 537) but do not agree. Too often, education in broadly developing countries is below par, with teachers teaching multiple grades at a time, with insufficient materials and often even failing to show up. The conceptualisation by OREALC/UNESCO (2008) can be applied in developed and developing countries and does not suggest that education is a commodity.

UNESCO's model, according to Murillo Torrecilla (2007) international large scale assessments only measure a part of what quality education is – effectiveness (p. 29).³⁷

This is not to say that international large scale assessments have not addressed non-cognitive skills at all. One of the first international assessments, the Six Subjects Study, implemented in nine countries in 1971, included the subject of civic education (Torney, Oppenheim & Farnen, 1975). The items for this assessment were written by a team including Bram Oppenheim, Judith Torney-Purta and several national coordinators.³⁸ This was followed up on, almost thirty years later, with the 1999 Civic Education Study (Torney-Purta et al., 2001) CIVED, and the 2010 and 2015 implementations of the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS), by the IEA. The role of the IEA in international education assessment is difficult to overestimate: it is thought of as having established the international comparative studies (ICS) paradigm when scholars gathered at the UNESCO Institute for Life-long Learning in Hamburg in 1958 to deal with assessment issues and established it (Kyriakides & Charalambous, 2014, p. 33; Postlethwaite, 1993). It is now gaining in prominence once more as the items for measuring progress on SDG Target 4.7, including Global Citizenship Education (Schulz et al., 2016, p. iii), will be integrated into future iterations of ICCS.

3.5 Competences, knowledge and skills

But what do we speak of when we speak of non-cognitive skills? It is important to note that educational assessment is largely based on, and often thought of as synonymous to, educational measurement, which is itself understood to coincide, to a large extent, with psychometrics – i.e. the measurement of psychological phenomena similarly to physical ones – indicating the central place of psychology in assessment.³⁹ This discourse focuses on traits: “a disposition to behave or

³⁷ I would add equity: through large-scale assessments, we are aware of structural inequalities in learning between different groups, such as gender groups or learners from different socioeconomic strata.

³⁸ Personal communication Prof. Torney-Purta, at Educational Testing Service (ETS) Conference, 12 January 2017.

³⁹ Gipps (2003, originally 1994) argued that, in the early 1990s, we faced a paradigm-change from psychometrics to educational measurement and educational assessment. While psychometrics certainly has certain connotations, as it has been accused of “positivism” (Berlak, 1992a, p. 182), it would be incorrect to characterise it differently than as a servant to educational assessment.

perform in some way in response to some kinds of stimuli or tasks, under some range of circumstances” (Kane, 2006, p. 30). Kane mentioned the example of knowing about chemistry, being able to answer questions pertaining to this realm and the ability to conduct experiments competently as a trait based on which levels of proficiency can be inferred. These traits represent the application of a skill to a domain (in Kane’s example, to the domain of chemistry), which Mislevy (2006) problematised as follows:

The world is a complicated place, and human brains and societies are particularly complicated bits of it. Too complicated, anyway, for people to grasp in their entirety. Hence we need to find ways to think about neighbourhoods of it. (p. 268-269)

While Mislevy did not mention non-cognitive skills explicitly, he referred to Markman (1999) who mentioned a social or interpersonal level (pp. 21, 24) of learning. Schmeiser and Welch (2006) addressed the issue of content domains (p. 316), juxtaposing them against cognitive skills similarly to how Krathwohl et al. (1964) juxtapose skills against domain content as a conceptual tool for developing learning outcomes (pp. 3-4). It is of note that, while Schmeiser and Welch referred to Bloom’s taxonomy in a sub-section on cognitive skills, this taxonomy consists of three domains, each of which Bloom’s team had planned to write a handbook for: the cognitive domain, Book I (Bloom et al., 1956/1984); the affective domain, Book II (Krathwohl et al., 1964); and the psychomotor domain for which a handbook was never written. It is also notable that in the case of Book II, likely most relevant to peace education, the team was not satisfied with their work (p. v)⁴⁰ – suggesting the persistent difficulty of measuring achievement of non-cognitive skills, as indicated by Bar-Tal (2009), decades later.

Of course, the mention of non-cognitive skills as learning outcomes that can be assessed separately from cognitive skills betrays an assumption of their separability, which Raven (1992) contested. Discussing a model of competence in which the cognitive, affective and conative coincide, Raven argued that the “widely accepted convention within psychometrics that one can use one set of scales to assess values and another set of scales to assess knowledge, skills,

⁴⁰ It is also of note that Bloom came from the University of Chicago, involved in the Six Subjects Study, and that extended an Honorary Doctor’s degree to Torsten Husén, considered a crucial co-founder of the ICS paradigm. It is possible that Bloom’s success was related to his alliance with this paradigm.

abilities, or competencies simply does not make sense” (p. 90). Raven argued that the cognitive, affective and conative elements of an activity must be assessed together because “affective and conative components are an integral part of what we mean by the ability to cognize” or, directly: one “cannot meaningfully assess” something “independently of the pleasure the person derives from doing so” (p. 89). Yet, this is clearly not true. One could argue that this should not be done, but it certainly can be done. One can, for example, become proficient in ironing shirts, while not liking to do so. Thus, while it may be true that important “abilities demand time, energy, and effort”, it still seems incorrect to conclude with Raven that as “a result, people only display them when they are undertaking activities which are important to them” (p. 89). This said, interest can certainly be construed as a factor in explaining performance.

PISA’s frequent references to competences or competencies⁴¹ have given the concept renewed attention. Through the DeSeCo project (Rychen & Salganik, 2001), OECD conceived several key competencies, which subsequently formed the theoretical underpinnings of the PISA studies (Ananiadou & Claro, 2009) as described in Sections 3.2 and 3.3. In line with Raven, and on behalf of the OECD (2005), Rychen and Salganik understood these as involving “the ability to meet complex demands, by drawing on and mobilising psychosocial resources (including skills and attitudes) in a particular context” (p. 4). For example, the “ability to communicate effectively is a competency that may draw on an individual’s knowledge of language, practical IT skills and attitudes towards those with whom he or she is communicating.” However, while DeSeCo certainly includes competencies relevant to peace education, such as 2-A, B and C (to relate well to others; interacting in heterogeneous groups; to manage and resolve conflicts, pp. 12-13), the authors concluded that while there had been experiments with “assessing individuals’ ability to co-operate with others ... so far it has been difficult to translate this into a workable assessment within an international survey” (p. 17).⁴² This does not seem to have changed.

⁴¹ While there is, sometimes, said to be a difference, in practice, these terms are often used interchangeably.

⁴² On non-cognitive skills, on behalf of OECD, Rychen and Salganik (2005) say: “A further step in assessment is to move beyond identifying cognitive abilities and to measure attitudes and dispositions.” They seem to refer mainly to metacognitive skills, as they observe: “PISA has initially done this primarily by asking students about their attitudes to learning and their motivations in a separate questionnaire” (p. 16).

3.6 Evaluation in peace education: The state of play

While the above testifies to the apparent intrinsic difficulties of educational assessment beyond the cognitive realm, into areas that Bar-Tal (2009) identified with peace education (p. 34), since Nevo and Brem's seminal claim of 2002, there have been two important developments that have moved the thinking on assessment in peace education forward since around 2010. On the one hand, there have been discussions in the field of assessment beyond the cognitive. Here the work of the LMTF can be mentioned, which led to initiatives such as '*Pruebas SER*', assessing civic, artistic and physical education skills in addition to cognitive assessment, in the Municipality of Bogotá in Colombia. This culminated in an international conference on this topic held in Bogotá in December 2015 (see: <http://congreso.sredecc.com/>). As a part of this stream of work, we can also consider the publication of a special issue on assessment of 21st century skills in the journal 'Applied Measurement in Education' (Vol. 29, Nr. 4). However, this concluded that this is still work in development (Geisinger, 2016, pp. 248-249), and even though they may be an essential part of peace education, it is problematic to simply equate peace education with non-cognitive skills. The field is too fragmented for that.⁴³

The second development consists of the publication of an entire edited volume on the topic of evaluation in peace education, titled *Peace Education Evaluation: Learning From Experience and Exploring Prospects*, with twenty contributions on evaluation in peace education (Del Felice et al., 2015). While many experts from the field of peace education contributed to this volume, it is important to note that it dealt with educational evaluation or programme evaluation, rather than assessment. It does not deal, overall, with learning outcomes or competencies, but with programme- and project objectives, thus lending it a focus on monitoring and evaluation rather than an educational assessment one, as discussed in Section 1.2. The vocabulary of educational assessment, referring to concepts such as those addressed in the American Council on Education (ACE) handbook on *Educational Measurement* is not used at all. The scarce existing literature on peace education evaluation does not address educational assessment. This suggests, in error, that the outcome of peace education programmes is peace, rather than changes in learners. We

⁴³ For example, Leming (1992) is said not to have been a friend of peace education, but addressed subjects under the header of education on contemporary issues that might, nowadays, be classified under the peace education umbrella.

thus observe a significant gap in the literature. Yet this gap not only pertains to understanding how to assess achievement of learning outcomes in peace education; it also pertains to what the outcomes that should be assessed, are.

A final note: large scale assessment has been used both for peace-related and opposite interests. For example, Coleman's et al.'s 1966 study on educational equity of opportunity (Kyriakides & Charalambous, 2014, p. 33) seemed inspired by a desire to make the world a "better, more human place" (Bar-Tal, 2009, p. 28). However, there are other instances where education and its assessment were understood in a context of international competition or even war: Schmeiser and Welch (2006), for example, cite the launch of the Sputnik in 1957 (p. 349; see Hambleton et al., 2016, p. 24), as a moment of reckoning where the United States felt it had to stay a scientific leader, for which good education was considered crucial. Similarly, Torney-Purta and Amadeo (2013) said that in the mid-1980s a US national education goal to be number one in the world in mathematics and science was announced, instructing the IEA to conduct the studies to confirm this leadership – leading to hand-wringing when it would turn out to be Japan, and later Finland, that would lead the international league tables (p. 88). Finally, Berlak (1992b) described how, in the same era, the US National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) suggested that, with the decline of its quality of its education, the US had "in effect been committing an act of unthinking unilateral disarmament" (cited in Berlak, p. 2).

4. Methodology

4.1 Research design and methodology

The clarification of how this study will tackle the research question first requires a discussion on the choice of an overarching research design to guide further methodological, operational and analytical choices. On research design, Robson (2002) divided primarily between flexible and non-flexible designs. Flexible designs, which are mainly oriented towards qualitative research, include case studies. Within the non-flexible category, which are mainly oriented towards quantitative research, Robson distinguished experimental from non-experimental research designs. Examples of the former are experiments, of which the randomised controlled trial (RCT) may be the purest expression, and quasi-experiments; main examples of the latter include surveys. The primary difference between both sub-designs is that experimental designs compare sets of cases with other sets, where these cases can be a wide range of different things, while non-experimental designs study phenomena without, necessarily, a comparative dimension, as is intrinsic in experimental designs.

The choice of design for this study was guided by the nature of the research question, i.e.: how should the achievement of learning outcomes in peace education be assessed? Taking a closer look, one notes that it is composed of four concepts, or constructs, that can each be assessed as belonging to the realm of social and cultural, rather than natural reality. This is of course to be expected in an educational research study. Peace; education; outcomes; and assessment are all things that cannot be observed directly in the natural world. As a consequence, they are all, to a greater or lesser extent, subject to subjectivity in being understood. For example, peace can mean one thing to one person and something else to another; the same counts for education and, as discussed in Section 1.1, there is significant disagreement as to what peace education is – or should be. A challenge here is thus to understand what it is that we do and should mean with words like peace, stipulating a requirement for an interpretive position on my part as researcher. To strengthen my interpretive position, and considering the importance of said concepts to

address the research question, an empirical investigation will be preceded by a conceptual analysis.

In addition to this, a closer look also reveals that the research question, which includes the word ‘should’, requires a normative rather than a descriptive answer. That is to say, it does not ask what is, but what ought to be. The main difference between a descriptive and a normative claim is that the former is based in objective truth or, more precisely, is subject to empirical falsification (see Popper, 2007). The latter, on the other hand, includes some extent of value judgements. This might be different if the question was formulated involving a dependent variable (e.g., how should we assess achievement *if* we aim to improve its acceptance among peace education professionals?), but this is not the case here; we want to know how it should be assessed, overall. As a result, this is not a question that can be answered by pure observation of natural facts. Additionally, as discussed in the previous chapter, assessment in peace education is a relatively new area, which contributes to the need to develop shared understandings. This, again, strengthened the argument for an interpretive approach. Yet, whereas the pilot study on holocaust education, mentioned in Note 11 (Chapter 1) was rather open in nature, the focus of this thesis was intended to be more concentrated.

On the basis of the criterion, I first excluded the option of a flexible design, as this seemed more suitable to open-ended study. In addition, as the most illustrative exponent of flexible designs, the case study is a design that may be used if a case is well-defined (Robson, 2002, p. 179) and as an instance of something. This is not the case here. When looking at non-flexible designs, as it was not my intention to compare groups, I could also rule out the experimental design. This left me with the category of non-flexible, non-experimental designs. Within this category, the survey, although responding to the requirement that it should allow for a concentrated focus (Robson, 2002, pp. 233-234) seemed too crude as it relies on large quantities of respondents. Given the specialised nature of the subject, it also seemed that quantity was not the main consideration for participation, but quality – expertise. The consensus I was looking for was expert consensus – and experts in a nascent area as the one subject to this study are not available in great numbers. In addition, expert opinion is best analysed in-depth, which is problematic with large-scale data as a survey would likely generate. Incidentally, while it might be possible to explore how peace

education programmes are currently assessed, using a meta-analysis or systematic review approach, although confirmatory, this would not address the normative element of the research question.

Within the category of non-flexible, non-experimental research designs, I found a group of methodologies that seemed to respond to all mentioned requirements: consensus methodologies. While seemingly having fallen into slight disuse, these methodologies are used to elicit expert consensus and, as Ager et al. (2007) indicated, “emerged as powerful tools to establish expert agreement on issues of practice” adding that this is “especially useful where evidence from formal research studies is inadequate and/or inappropriate to inform judgments” (p. 124; on this, also see Minas & Jorm, 2010). Given the scarce theory (Section 3.6), this seemed very apt. Within this group of methodologies, two are most often mentioned: Delphi and nominal group procedure. In the first approach, a group of experts “are polled individually and anonymously, usually with self-administered questionnaires. The survey is conducted over three or four ‘rounds’, but after each one, the results are elicited, tabulated and then reported to the group” (Fink et al., 1991, p. 2). By contrast the “nominal group process is a structured meeting that attempts to provide an orderly procedure for obtaining qualitative information from target groups who are most closely associated with a problem area” (p. 2). Fink et al. mention two additional methodologies (NIH consensus and Glaser’s state-of-the-art approach), but indicate that these have not been standardised.

4.2 Delphi

Given these options, after careful consideration, I chose the option of Delphi ‘method’, or rather: methodology. This choice was based on three principal reasons: firstly, Delphi is considered the consensus methodology with the greatest repute⁴⁴ and most extensive track record of successful applications and, therefore, methodological memory. Delphi, as Dalkey and Helmer (1963) argued, is appropriate to “obtain the most reliable consensus of opinion of a group of experts” (p.

⁴⁴ It may be considered somewhat ironic that Delphi methodology was originally developed by the United States-based RAND Corporation, which is a think-tank of the US Armed Forces.

1). Secondly, it offers a possibility of non-presential implementation. This was highly valuable, given that experts in the field of peace education and its assessment are few, live far apart and that a presential meeting was thus hardly possible. In addition - and in part due - to the advantage of not requiring a physical meeting of participants, it offered anonymity conditions, which I suspected might be a benefit from a research ethical position and would help experts form their opinion freely, and reformulate them if that would be considered valid. That is to say, ego would be likely to play a small role in data collection. Finally, but importantly, as Rescher (1969) argued, Delphi offers a useful framework for addressing normative, or what he called value questions. As Hsu and Sandford (2007) further clarified, Delphi is:

... a widely used and accepted method for achieving convergence of opinion concerning real-world knowledge solicited from experts within certain topic areas ... the Delphi technique is designed as a group communication process that aims at conducting detailed examinations and discussions of a specific issue for the purpose of goal setting, policy investigation, or predicting the occurrence of future events ... Common surveys try to identify “what is,” whereas the Delphi technique attempts to address “what *could/should be*” (Miller, 2006). [Emphasis mine] (p. 1)

In addition to the ability to deal with normative questions, Linstone and Turoff (1975) indicated that Delphi is also able to deal with complexity:

A method for structuring a group communication process so that the process is effective in allowing a group of individuals, as a whole, to deal with a complex problem. (p. 3)

Incidentally, Delphi is normally referred to as a method rather than a methodology. This seems incorrect. While the line between methodologies and research methods may be porous, these are not interchangeable concepts. In some cases, the distinction is clear: for example, the research method of a test can be nested within an experimental design to measure whether a treatment X has had a specifiable effect; or a non-experimental one, to measure the state of learning of a class without an element of comparison. However, Robson (2002), for example, classifies the survey as a method, albeit with reference to divergent views (pp. 228-229), which is questionable. A survey seems rather to be a design or methodology, within which data collection methods such as questionnaires or interviews may be nested. To my mind, the same is the case with Delphi: this is

a non-flexible, non-experimental research design or methodology, within the framework of which methods such as questionnaires or interviews can be applied. Designations of Delphi as a method instead of a methodology are thus erroneous.

In a short history of the methodology, which was developed by the RAND corporation (a think-tank formed to support the United States Army, founded in 1948 and financed mainly by the US government) in the 1950s, Cuhls (undated) explained that its name was derived from an ancient oracle:

For a thousand years of recorded history the Greeks and other peoples, sometimes as private individuals, sometimes as official ambassadors, came to Delphi to consult the prophetess, who was called Pythia. Her words were taken to reveal the rules of the Gods. These prophecies were not usually intended simply to be a prediction of the future as such. Pythia's function was to tell the divine purpose in a normative way in order to shape coming events. (p. 94)

The oracle, thus, did not foretell an inevitable future but, rather, extended judgements on what should be. With clear relevance to the mission of peace education, Cuhls (undated) argued that: "Thanks to the oracle, the Greek people learned over many generations to abstain from bloody vendetta, to apply to courts when quarrelling in private life occurred, and to solve disputes in a fair way. It can be traced back to the oracle that one should not poison the well of one's enemy and should take care of the olive trees in war" (p. 94).

As mentioned, Delphi methodology consists of a series of rounds of data collection (for example, interviews or the administration of questionnaires), applied to a set number of experts, with feedback between rounds, with the aim of achieving a final, consensuated position on a specific issue. In the case of this study, the issue is derived from the research question: how should the achievement of learning outcomes in peace education be assessed? This process culminates in the mentioned consensuated position (expert consensus), which, in the case of this study, will be reflected in a 'statement of principles' as briefly mentioned in Section 1.4. In addition to its methodological suitability, I also considered that it would be of interest to see to what extent the application of a Delphi would prove apt for developing consensus in a community of practice or even establish a community of practice. This could be considered relevant considering that,

currently, there does not seem to exist a community of practice uniting the fields of educational assessment and peace education.

As to the statement of principles, this should preferably be a short document, so as to make it practicable for the experts to provide feedback. The provision of feedback is central to applications of Delphi, as this is what “allows and encourages the selected Delphi participants to reassess their initial judgments about the information provided in previous iterations” (Hsu & Sandford, 2007, p. 2). While Cuhls (undated) suggested a minimum of two rounds (p. 93), Hsu and Sandford (2007) argued that, according to most authors, three rounds are sufficient, in particular if literature is available on the subject (p. 2).

As this study targeted experts with presumably limited time, and without offering financial incentives, and finally as relevant literature indicated that three rounds might be sufficient, in this study, three rounds were applied as follows:

1. *Administration of an open-ended questionnaire*, to identify main issues (Annex V). Depending on the participant, this could be and in some cases was administered as a semi-structured interview.
2. *Elaboration of a preliminary position paper* of 1-2 pp., the ‘statement of principles’, based on questionnaire data, and outlining draft principles of assessment in peace education (Annex VI) referring directly to main issues identified in the literature, and the research process, in relation to the subject. In this phase, participants could comment and make annotations.
3. *Elaboration of final position paper* of 1-2 pp., or statement of principles, accounting for the feedback received in Round 2, outlining principles of assessment in peace education (Annex VIII) referring directly to the main issues identified in the literature, and the research process, in relation to the subject. In this phase, participants could indicate their adherence, if applicable, and identify points of dissent. It served as a phase of validation of the draft statement in terms of capturing the expert consensus.

In the implementation of these different rounds, the time-line included in Section 4.7 below was realised.

4.3 Sampling, participants and access

Hsu and Sandford (2007) mentioned as a particular point of contention in Delphi the issue of selection of participants, both in terms of quantity and selection criteria, mentioning that “no exact criterion currently listed in the literature concerning the selection of Delphi participants” (p. 3) exists. They cited Ludwig (1994), indicating that the main consideration regarding the pooling of experts should be their representativeness in respect of the subject at hand; yet, in general, they considered that around 10-15 participants constitute a reasonable number for an application of Delphi. Similarly, Schulz and Renn (2009) recommended that the group does not exceed 16-25 persons (p. 14). Hsu and Sandford also cited Oh (1974) in saying that “choosing appropriate subjects is generally based on the judgment and discretion of the principal investigators” (p. 3). For this reason, we now turn to this issue.

Of course, there does not exist a list of the leading experts in peace education, let alone in the assessment of learning outcomes in peace education. The task of selecting participants for this study was further complicated by the fact that, as discussed in Chapter 2, the research question addresses an encounter of two ‘paradigms’: that of peace education and that of educational assessment. From which field to invite experts? Given the analysis at the end of Section 1.2, according to which understanding assessment in peace education is contingent on the agreement on learning outcomes for this field, I decided that priority should be given to experts in peace education, hopefully with expertise in educational assessment. Further considerations whom to invite came from experts on Delphi, according to whom it is important that the experts in the application represent several positions in respect of the subject to be addressed (Schulz & Renn, 2009, p. 14). To respond to this, I decided to consider four variables as a proxy for different views: geographic spread, to avoid cultural bias; gender, to avoid gender bias; professional group or institutional affiliation; and field of concentration within peace education. Incidentally, as the

objective of the study was consensus rather than differences, these variables were used for participant selection but not considered as significant factors in the analysis.

Thus I selected potential participants from different geographical regions (including sub-Saharan Africa; Asia and the Pacific; and Latin America and the Caribbean, in addition to Europe and North America); in terms of gender; and of professional groups (academics; international civil servants; non-governmental organisation workers; and the final list included a religious leader) from a range of different organisations; and different streams within peace education. While this resulted in an initial list of candidate participants, identified through personal networks, literature reviews and internet searches, this list was modified along the way as invitations to participate were not responded to, were declined or accepted but not followed up on. Finally, and while 22 persons agreed to participate, after several reminders, 16 responses were received for Round 1 of the Delphi. This was still a good group size, considering Hsu and Sandford's and Schulz and Renn's recommendations. In line with Schulz and Renn (2009) it could be argued that too large a group of experts would not only become unmanageable for the precise, in-depth analyses that consensus methodologies require, in contrast with, for example, surveys, but also that consensus becomes more difficult to elicit, the larger the group might be.

While noting that, as mentioned, participants have been anonymised⁴⁵, the following six women and ten men participated in this Delphi:

ID	Country ⁴⁶	Gender	Category	Function
1	US	F	University	Global expert in peace education (conflict resolution)
2	US	M	University	Global expert in peace education (philosophy of education)
3	Colombia	M	University	Regional expert in peace education (psychology)
4	US	F	University	Global expert in peace education (human rights education)
5	Costa Rica	F	UN Organisation	Global expert in peace education
6	Costa Rica	M	UN Organisation	Global expert in peace education
7	South Korea	F	UNESCO Institute	Global expert in peace education (global citizenship education)

⁴⁵ The thesis supervisor had access to the full list of names.

⁴⁶ Country denotes country of residence during the research.

8	UK	M	University	Global expert in peace education evaluation
9	US	F	University	Global expert in peace education (international and multicultural education)
10	Qatar	F	Think-tank	Global expert in peace education (education in emergencies)
11	Democratic Republic Congo	M	Non-governmental organisation	Regional expert in peace education
12	Nigeria	M	University	Regional expert in peace education
13	US	M	University	Global expert in peace education (global citizenship education)
14	Germany	M	Religious organisation	Religious leader and thought leader in peace education
15	Germany	M	University	National expert in peace education evaluation
16	Austria	M	University	Global expert in peace education evaluation

Tab. 1: Description of participants

The selected participants were accessed, normally, by e-mail (although a few were first accessed in person), with a request to participate in the study (see Annex II). The invitation was accompanied by an information sheet with background information on the study and an informed consent form, that the invitees were asked to sign and return.

4.4 Methods

As mentioned above, this study consisted of two main elements: the empirical element, consisting of an application of Delphi, which was preceded by a non-empirical element consisting of a conceptual analysis. As discussed in Section 1.2, and as per the Delphi methodology, this empirical element was implemented using questionnaires, which, if possible, were substituted by semi-structured interviews, following the structure of the questionnaires for Round 1 of the Delphi. These methods were administered, if questionnaires, by Word documents attached to e-mail; and if semi-structured interviews, either by Skype or, in a few cases, in person. In all these cases, recordings were made of the interviews, and these recordings were transcribed by an external firm,⁴⁷ which were, finally, reviewed by me.

⁴⁷ The external firm signed a confidentiality agreement.

The questionnaire – or interview protocol – was developed based on initial literature reviews and the conceptual analysis, as summarised in the next chapter, and reviewed by my thesis supervisor (see final version included as Annex V). A pre-pilot was held in which a social scientist was asked to complete the questionnaire and provide feedback. It was structured in such a way that participants could comment on the questionnaire, in the case they thought something in it was missing. Question 1 of the questionnaire asked for the biography of the participant in relation to peace education; Question 2 addressed the first main concept of the study, peace; Question 3 addressed the second main concept, peace education; and Question 4, the third one, learning outcomes in peace education. The concept of educational assessment in general was addressed in Question 5, while Questions 6 and 7 focused on assessment specifically within the context of peace education. Question 8, finally, asked whether participants would like to add anything. The questionnaire contained only open-ended questions.

For Round 2 of Delphi, the methods consisted in feedback written directly on the draft statement of principles or as comments in a separate document, be it the body of an e-mail message or an attached Word- or similar document. These comments were numbered and included in a register (in Excel format), and dealt with, one by one (Annex VII). The register, which included my responses – i.e. an indication of how I dealt with the comment, and why – in addition to the original comments was sent back to the participants, in Round 3, so that they could verify that their concern had been taken into account and evaluate whether they agreed with the way that it had been dealt with. Round 3 consisted of an e-mail, administered to all 16 participants that had responded to Round 1, to ask whether they agreed with the final statement, *grosso modo*; agreed with qualifications; or did not agree. These different instances of feedback on the statement formed important safeguards to ensure the statement was rooted in expert consensus.

4.5 Data analysis strategy

While quantitative analyses can be applied to Delphi (Schulz & Renn, 2009; Hsu & Sandford, 2007, p. 4), I believe that, due to the relatively small number of participants, this is not very

effective. Quantitative analytical strategies will usually be statistical methods and statistical operations have limited significance when dealing with small quantities as, for example, the central limit theorem only applies with sufficiently large samples. In general, the greater the quantities, the greater chances are that frequency distributions will take on the form of a normal distribution, and thus that parameters such as means will be representative of the population. In addition, a quantitative approach in Delphi is most applicable when closed questions are used, which was not the case in this study. Therefore, statistical analysis techniques were not applied in the course of this research project for the analysis of the data and instead, in line with its interpretive nature (see Section 4.1), qualitative analysis was applied.

As the challenge in Delphi lies in the correct treatment – interpretation, analysis – of subject perceptions, so as to elicit a group position, both the management of group process and the consideration that qualitative data are being dealt with, are important. Following Bilagher (2005), qualitative data are understood as any data – which may or may not be quantified – that emanate from subjective perception. That is to say, the experts' views, as they are subjective, namely, based on their own perceptions rather than an objective judgement, are considered qualitative data. Thus, it was incumbent on me to encounter a data analysis strategy that would account for qualitative (subjective) data, and deal with the specific requirements of Delphi methodology.⁴⁸ It turned out to be critical to find a way to deal with contradictions – while some of the found contradictions were dealt with through the methodology itself, and in particular the different rounds, in other cases, choices had to be made.

Given that what was sought was a set of principles to guide the further development of assessment in peace education, coherence, and specifically theoretical coherence, seemed of paramount importance. It seemed that what I was after was the development of a theory on assessment in peace education, grounded in the empirical data of the study – a requirement perfectly filled by Glaser and Strauss' grounded theory techniques (1967/2009), which they themselves call method of constant comparison. This works on the basis of two main techniques:

⁴⁸ Specific recommendations and indications were also derived from proponents of Delphi methodology itself, such as looking for convergence of data.

coding and categorisation of data emanating from data collection through the used method(s), roughly as follows (cf. Robson, 2002, p. 493):⁴⁹

1. First review of data – i.e. questionnaires and interview transcripts - or open coding, to identify key ideas (conceptual categories) within interview data;
2. Second review of data, or axial coding to find relationships between these categories and thus identify key themes;
3. Third review of data (selective coding), to account for these relationships through core categories underpinning the themes.

With regard to this last point (3), it is important to note that, even though the strategy is mainly empirical, at this level it is the researcher that should solve any apparent contradictions in the data by appealing to higher levels of abstraction than those present in the data themselves. As Glaser and Strauss (2009) explain:

This is an inductive method of theory development. To make theoretical sense of so much diversity in his data, the analyst is forced to develop ideas *on a level of generality higher in conceptual abstraction than the qualitative material being analyzed*. He is forced to bring out underlying uniformities and diversities, and to use more abstract concepts to account for differences in the data. [Emphasis mine] (p. 114)

In reality this has been an iterative process, which involved going back and forth between phases, but Glaser and Strauss allow for this. In practice, in relation to Step 1, I selected in each transcript key ideas pertaining to one of the four main concepts of the study. These were transferred to a cross-table in Excel. This exercise was relatively straightforward, as the questionnaire – or interview protocol – was structured around these concepts, with each assigned at least one question. There were no quality criteria for key ideas – they did not have to be original, for instance. For example, a respondent might say that she believes that learning outcomes of peace education should not be assessed at all.

⁴⁹ In fact, these can be considered a specific application of what Miles and Huberman (1994) call a “fairly classic set of analytic moves” (p. 9, in Robson, 2002, p. 459), even though Glaser and Strauss’ work precedes that of Miles and Huberman as well as Robson’s.

In Step 2, I scanned all of the key ideas for themes (i.e., I looked for connections between the codes).⁵⁰ It should be mentioned that themes are formal, and not substantive.⁵¹ That is to say, one theme could contain diametrically opposed ideas. For example, a theme within peace could be the definition of positive peace, but subsequently the position in relation to this theme could be different by participant. In Step 3, a greater level of abstraction was sought to either come to a conclusion on a theme, or harmonise apparent tensions within it.

To give an example of this process: at Step 1, a participant might say, in relation to the question of what peace is, that he or she does not define peace for pragmatic reasons. This is a key idea. Another participant might say that there is not ‘one peace’ but there are ‘many peaces’ (another key idea) while again other respondents might give the definition that peace is the presence of justice. In Step 2, I would compare and contrast these key ideas with one another, with a view to categorising them. There may be respondents that, for one reason or another, cannot or wish not to define peace education; another group might define peace in a certain way; and a third group in another. In Step 3, I would go to a higher level of abstraction to reconcile the disagreement reflected in the existence of these different groups. It could be, for example, that the categories differ in some respects, but that there is one underlying trait that unites, and so reconciles what first appeared to be divergence of interpretation or difference of opinion.

On the basis of such building blocks, used to elicit a coherent substantive theory of the subject, a first draft statement of principles was developed and sent to the participants for review. This constituted Round 2. The comments received on this first draft, through Round 2, were gathered in a register of comments. Responses to each of the comments were included in this register and changes were made to the statement of principles in line with these responses. At this stage, the view was to maintain a coherent and intelligible statement, which would be viewed as valid and – in as far as possible – comprehensive as to the area addressed by it. In Round 3, the proposed final statement was sent to the participants for validation, along with the register with comments

⁵⁰ Nested within this overall analytical scheme, I applied some of the techniques suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994) for ‘generating meaning’ (pp. 245-246, cited in Robson, 2002, pp. 480-481).

⁵¹ This use of ‘substantive’ and ‘formal’ is not to be confused with Glaser and Strauss’ (2009) concepts of substantive and formal grounded theory. While substantive grounded theory applies to one domain, formal theory can apply across domains (p. 79).

and responses, as described in the previous section. It must be noted that the stages of feedback (Round 2) and validation (Round 3) served as a safeguard against an incorrect interpretation of the emerging consensus on my part – a significant risk, as the analysis of the data was certainly not a mechanical exercise and involved judgement at various points.

4.6 Ethical considerations

Research ethics are critically important for research work that has the intention to contribute something to society ('do good') and the academic community, not only from a perspective of considering that the ends may not justify the means, but also from the consideration of the possibility that the ends might be harmful, or that other harmful ends may be served by it. While I followed the research ethical guidelines of the British Educational Research Association, of which I am a member, throughout this study, there are a few specific issues that need to be highlighted in the context of this research project on peace and education.

The British Educational Research Association or BERA (2011) research ethical guidelines are structured along the constituencies of educational research and address, respectively: the participants; the sponsors of research; the community of educational researchers; and educational professionals, policy makers and the general public. The first category of constituencies addresses mainly, but not exclusively, the requirement that no adverse effects result to participants. To this end, the guidelines firstly stress the need for voluntary informed consent. I developed an informed consent form for the purpose of this study (Annex IV), which among other things emphasised the right of each participant to withdraw. All 16 participants indicated their consent to participate by signing this form.

Other important issues in this category include detriment arising from participation in research, privacy and use of incentives. To respond to the first-mentioned concern, an information sheet (Annex III) was developed and sent to all invitees to participate, along with the introductory e-mail (Annex II). On the issue of privacy, according to the BERA (2011) guidelines, "confidential and anonymous treatment of participants' data is considered the norm for the conduct of

research” (p. 7). Following this indication, anonymity was applied. As to use of incentives, given that the default position in social science research is not to use incentives, or rather that their use should be considered only when “the positive forces to cooperate are low” (COPAFS, 1993) and I considered this not to be the case, no incentives were used.

Considerations related to the second category of constituencies, sponsors of research, this was not relevant, as the study was entirely funded by myself. The category of responsibility to the educational research community pertains mainly to misconduct, such as falsification of findings and (in-) correct attribution. To ensure (auditable) adherence to this, I maintained records including e-mails and contributions by participants, on the one hand, and quoted ideas that were not my own, on the other. In this regard, it is important to note that the statement of principles reflects some extent of expert consensus that was developed through a process facilitated by me, as researcher, but the ideas themselves emanated from this process itself, and can thus only be considered mine based on the participants’ contributions. This said, I frequently resorted to finding solutions to apparent contradictions in the data by going to a higher level of abstraction.

For example, one participant mentioned that peace is the social purpose, and not the learning outcome of peace education. This idea made its way to the statement, due to its explanatory value for the theory, and while I agree with it, this was not my original idea. It came up through empirical data collection and analysis. A similar example is the notion that assessment in peace education may help rethink assessment in general. This idea, again, did not originate with me, but I could not attribute it to a specific participant, due to the anonymity clause. The added value, and the newness of my contribution, then lay in bringing such ideas together, choosing one over the other and crafting a coherent set of principles from this. One could say that the analysis of the data was mine and the statement, shared – reflecting a consensus.

As to the fourth category of responsibilities to education professionals, policy makers and the wider society, this relates, to a great extent, to the issue of relevance. Clearly, the study asked time from experts that might have been used for other purposes. I believe that this investment is offset by the social benefit that the study might bring: increased knowledge of peace education, which is hoped itself to bring important benefits to societies across the world. This initiative may

be specifically relevant given the rising importance of SDG Target 4.7: a development target that the world community may rally behind and thus, in the words of Annan (2013), help create an incentive for governments to bring this about (see Section 2.2).

There are only a few specific ethical issues known to be related to implementation of Delphi methodology, mainly in relation to confidentiality. As a typical characteristic, Delphi maintains anonymity of the participants to reduce group pressure to conform or avoidance of losing face becoming an important consideration. On the other hand, there is the conception that the face validity of the final position paper will, to a large extent, depend on the credibility of the experts participating in the process (see Table 1).

Finally, there are issues related to research on politically charged subjects, such as education and peace, which are related to the guidelines' fourth category. The controversy in relation to the Israeli and Palestine curricula (Bar-Tal and Adwan, 2013) is an illustration of the extent to which mainstream, formal education can be interpreted, and portrayed, as education for war. In this controversy, this was said to be the case if textbooks did not recognise the borders of a state or if a given population would structurally be portrayed negatively. To address such differences in understanding, for example of the concept of peace, as mentioned in Section 4.1, I decided to problematise them and discuss before proceeding with the analysis of the empirical data (see Ch. 5). To my understanding, the instances of feedback, validation and the philosophy of consensus methodology overall implied a solid basis for the assumption that the understanding reflected in the final version of the statement of principles, is a shared one.

Finally, ethical clearance was requested and obtained through official King's College London procedures in which all of the main ethical considerations related to the study were discussed, and for which relevant documentation was prepared (see Annex I).

4.7 Implementation of the methodology

This study commenced in academic year 2014, with a view, first, to finalise it in 2015; then 2016; and finally 2017, partly due to unforeseen circumstances. The time-line below reflects the main milestones of this trajectory in schematic form:

Month	Task	Remarks
Sep 2014	Development of research proposal	
Sep 2014 – cont.	Literature review	
Sep 2014 – cont.	Search and selection of participants	
Apr 2015	Research proposal approved by supervisor	
May	Ethical clearance request	
Aug	Ethical clearance obtained	After one revision
Aug	Instrument design: open-ended questionnaire	
Aug	Invitation to participants: Round 1 (first batch)	By e-mail
Oct 2016	Data analysis	
Oct	First draft of ‘statement of principles’ sent (Round 2)	By e-mail
Oct	Development of first version of RBT	
Jan 2017	Second draft of ‘statement of principles’ sent (Round 3)	By e-mail
Feb 2017	Development of second version of RBT	
Apr – Jul	Development of versions 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7 of RBT	
Sep	Submission of final RBT (8)	

Tab. 2: Timeline for specific tasks

Firstly, the updated research proposal⁵² was developed from September 2014, and approved by the thesis supervisor in April 2015. Meanwhile, both the literature review and conceptual analysis commenced, continuing throughout the process of the study. In addition to emerging articles and recommendations for reading, I had developed a reading list. Also from September 2014 onwards participants were searched and selected, based on the literature review, personal

⁵² The initial study proposal was submitted as an assignment in the course-work part of the study.

networks and Internet searches, using terms including ‘peace education’ AND ‘evaluation’ OR ‘assessment’ and similar ones (see Section 4.3).

Immediately after this, in May of the same year, I prepared and sent in the ethical clearance request. This clearance was obtained in August, after one additional iteration, addressing a comment on the provision of anonymity, which had been raised in this process. The ethical clearance also meant clearance of the informed consent form and information sheet that would be sent with the invitation to the empirical part of the study. After this, still in August, I sent the proposed questionnaire for Round 1 to the supervisor for approval.

In parallel, a register of (candidate) participants in Excel was established, to follow up on contacts with the candidate participants and, from August 2015, invitations to the same were sent out via e-mail, in batches of variable size. Initial responses were mixed: some candidates agreed to participate, a similar number declined, and some did not respond at all. In several cases, the e-mail address did not seem to be valid, as error messages were received. All those invited were asked to sign and return the informed consent form. Batches continued to be sent out until an acceptable number of respondents, as per Delphi guidelines, was achieved (N=16, but see below: a total of 22 invitees had agreed to participate but some failed to respond to Round 1). In general, significant prompting was necessary to follow up on implementation of the different rounds of Delphi.

Data collection for Round 1, and (emerging) analysis was extended up to around one year, in part due to necessary measures to follow up on response and continuous recruitment of participants, and in part to an international move from Santiago de Chile to Washington, DC (United States). After preliminary coding of all the questionnaires or transcripts, as was the case, I constructed a cross-table juxtaposing participants against their responses on each of the questions. In October 2016, I completed the first version of the data analysis, refining this in order to develop the first draft of the ‘statement of principles’, which was sent to the 16 participants in the course of the same month, effectively constituting Round 2. Feedback for this formally closed later that month but, in practice, was received until early January 2017. On this basis, the final version of the statement of principles was developed, and sent out to the 16 participants early in January 2017.

(Round 3), with the request to either: agree, grosso modo; agree, with reservations; or not agree with the content of the statement. With most of the material available at that point, a first draft of the full thesis – including all planned sections – was sent in to the supervisor in October 2016, and feedback received the same month.

In terms of survival, while 64 persons were invited to participate, and 22 candidates agreed to participate in the study, only 16 effectively participated in Round 1. Responses were received from nine participants for Round 2 and from nine for Round 3. Of these, eight agreed grosso modo with the statement of principles, and one agreed, ‘with reservations’. No participant(s) indicated that they did not agree with the final statement of principles.

5. Conceptual analysis

5.1 Introduction

The research question that this thesis addresses contains at least four key concepts that need to be clarified: peace; (peace) education; (peace education) learning outcomes; and assessment of achievement (of peace education learning outcomes). For the sake of intelligibility, this analysis will follow this sequential order. It will first discuss the concept of peace as per the relevant literature, and explore what this may mean in the context of peace education; then, it investigates the concept of education on peace, with a view to understanding how these two concepts – peace and education – interrelate; thirdly, it will discuss learning outcomes, or objectives, with relevance to peace education; and, finally, it will address the concept of assessment in relation to learning outcomes in peace education.

This discussion has informed the development of research instruments for this study, and will inform the analysis of the empirical data, included in the following chapter, which will refer to elements of this conceptual analysis.

5.2 The search for peace: An elusive concept

The word peace is rooted, etymologically, in the Latin word *pax*, which itself has a variety of meanings, including agreement and tranquillity. In practice, it has often been understood negatively rather than positively, that is to say, as the absence of violence or war rather than as the presence of ‘something’. When it is understood positively, it is usually described quite broadly, for example, according to Danesh (2008) peace is “an all-encompassing state of being that affects all aspects of human individual and group life” (p. 166). While the contemporary literature tends to assume that this distinction between negative and positive peace originates with who is considered the founder of the field of peace studies (not peace education), Johan Galtung, in 1932, Montessori (2008) already argued that: “What is generally meant by the word

peace is the cessation of war. But this negative concept is not an adequate description of genuine peace” (p. 8).

Nevertheless, it was Galtung (1975) who developed these two concepts of peace, i.e. ‘negative’ and ‘positive peace’ explicitly, which have come to dominate the field of peace studies and, by extension, peace education. On this, he said that:

Negative peace, [should be] defined as the absence of organized violence between such *major human groups* as nations, but also between racial and ethnic groups of the magnitude that can be reached by internal wars; and positive peace, [is to be] defined as a pattern of cooperation and integration between major human groups. [Emphasis mine] (p. 29)

For example, if in a territory such as present-day Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories there were no overt or direct violence from either side, there would be ‘negative peace’; but if there were still some important issues preventing “cooperation and integration between major human groups” (p. 29), there could not be said to be positive peace. Thus, when Montessori (2008) said that: “Human history teaches us that peace means the forcible submission of the conquered to domination once the invader has consolidated his victory, the loss of everything the vanquished hold dear, and the end of the enjoyment of the fruits of their labour and their conquests” (p. 6), she referred to how negative peace does not of its own result in positive peace. To further clarify the type of violence that prevents positive peace in a context of negative peace, Galtung (1975) developed the concept of “structural violence” (p. 251). This denotes practices that hinder some group achieving their full potential. For example, if women consistently receive lower pay for the same work as men, this suggest structural violence against women. Conversely, if men consistently have higher rates of incarceration or homelessness, this suggests structural violence against men.

While the mentioned Israel–Palestine conflict would suggest otherwise, it is notable that the concept of peace has often been brought in relation to, or is said to originate in, religion (Duckworth, 2008; Harris, 2008a; Harris and Morrison, 2013; Montessori, 2008). In reality, it is not easy to argue in favour of this relation; rather, the opposite seems often the case: that religion has a special relation with warfare. In possibly Hinduism’s main text, the *Bhagavad Gita*, the

Deity Krishna incited the warrior Arjuna to fight against a related clan, for a greater good. In fact, he argued that, for a person of the *kṣatria* (warrior) class, it would be a sin not to fight (Verse 2:31), of course as long as it is for a good cause. Similarly, in the Jewish Bible, also referred to as the Torah, we see that God ordered Moses to enter into the land of Canaan – roughly the present-day Israel and Occupied Palestinian Territories – and kill every Canaanite: man, woman and child (Deuteronomy 20:16-18). In Islam, while not formally one of its five pillars, warfare is present as the small Jihad or Holy War and the Qur'an, Islam's main text, contains several indications for how a righteous war should be fought (see, for example, Aya Ali Imran, 3:14). As to Buddhism, Jerryson and Juergensmeyer (2010) argued that even this religion, known for its peacefulness, has a violent side.

While it has been said that Christianity, like Buddhism, is not a religion of war, we see indications to the contrary also here. For example, Christianity's Messiah Jesus said he had come to "bring the sword" (Matthew 10:34). On the practical side, Christianity has instigated several Crusades; it has been used to justify colonisation in Latin America; and the Spanish Inquisition has been known to be specifically cruel. In line with this, Catholic Saint Augustine (Augustinus, 5th century CE/2007,), born in the 4th century CE and widely understood to have been Christianity first major philosopher, while stating in his magnum opus *City of God* that "peace is such a great good that even in terms of the earthly and the temporal, there is nothing more pleasing to be heard, nothing more desirable and nothing more magnificent" (p. 956 ff.) is also credited with the invention of the concept of righteous war (p. 952 – although Livy referred to this as well, Machiavelli, 1532/1998, p. 158) when arguing that "every human being strives for peace through war, and not for war through peace" (Augustinus, 2007, p. 957).

Within the framework of this thesis, the relevance of St. Augustine's views are to a large extent based on his ideas of peace and citizenship as they illuminate our understandings of global citizenship. This is important, as peace and its absence (violence, war) are conceived by Galtung, not coincidentally, as between major human groups. These groups can be religious but, as a group, are often part of a political unit such as a state, or a city-state, which has citizens. In the *City of God*, Augustine contrasted the earthly city of injustice (Rome, in the conventional

reading) with the eternal City of God, which is metaphysical. This city unites people regardless of their differences as perceived physically:⁵³

So while this heavenly city dwells on earth as a stranger, she calls its citizens from all peoples and gathers its community from among all languages; in this, she does not worry about what may be different among them in terms of customs, their laws or their institutions, aimed at obtaining and maintaining earthly peace; she does not abolish or cancel any of this; on the contrary, she preserves it and adapts to it, because all that may be different among different people is still aimed at the same thing: earthly peace. The only thing is that it may not become an obstacle for the religion that it is the one and only God that must be honoured. (Augustinus, 2007, p. 970)

This idea of a citizenship based on values is found again only much later, with Kant (1795/2008) in *Perpetual Peace*. While this work started out with a state-based framework, Kant argued that “originally, no one has more right to be somewhere on this planet than anyone else” (p. 21). Peace itself he understood to be “the end of all hostilities” (p. 3), proposing six principles for world peace, among which that countries should abolish their armies (Thesis 3, p. 5), which at present Costa Rica and Iceland have done (Harris and Morrison, 2013, p. 15), and should not make foreign debts (Thesis 4, p. 6). This work is also known for the first mention of a league of nations (“*Völkerbund*”, p. 16), often interpreted as referring to an organisation such as today’s United Nations (UN)⁵⁴ – the organisation promoting the idea of global citizenship in the present time. The UN (1999), incidentally, understand peace as a ‘culture of peace’: “a set of values, attitudes, modes of behaviour and ways of life that reject violence and prevent conflicts by tackling their root causes to solve problems through dialogue and negotiation among individuals, groups and nations” (Article 1).

This relation between states and peace is so important that it can be justifiably said that positive peace has been interpreted as the perfect state (Manuel and Manuel, 1979), in which the meanings of state of being and nation-state have merged. This idea gave rise to the literary genre of utopia, named after one of its earliest manifestations, Thomas More’s *Utopia*. Utopias have

⁵³ Please note that this citation is a translation from Dutch to English by myself. In this chapter, there are several citations that have been translated from the original language. Unless indicated otherwise, all translations in this and following chapters I am responsible for.

⁵⁴ Indeed, a League of Nations existed from 1920 to 1946, which was widely regarded as a forerunner to the UNO.

often been understood as criticisms of what is (Horkheimer, 1930, p. 86) rather than descriptions of a perfect state. For example, towards the end of his utopia, More (1516/2001) confessed that “in the Utopian commonwealth are very many features which in our societies I would wish rather than expect to see” (p. 135). Closer to our time, Harris and Morrison (2013) recognised the importance of utopias when arguing that “visioning” is fundamental to peace education (pp. 40), citing Boulding (2000) in that “utopian visioning and utopian experiments persist through time as an expression of the human longing for peaceable lifeways” (in Harris & Morrison, 2013, p. 40). This consists of envisioning an ideal future that, working backwards, is translated into concrete steps to be realised. It is hardly possible to not recognise Mumford’s (1923) “utopia of reconstruction” in this – those that are not utopias of escape, which are brought about through divine action, but can be brought about by human action (p. 15).

The idea that peace, understood as ideal, is an ideal state, or utopia, was vigorously criticised by Popper (2003), according to whom utopias are, almost by definition, tyrannical. In *The Open Society and its Enemies*, he argued that a utopia constitutes a fixed set of rules which may be ideal, but that one is not allowed to disagree with. He likened Marx to a ‘prophet’ (p. 10, see also Popper, 1994) who purported to see the future of humankind based on scientific principles related to human nature. Applying Hegel’s idea that the end of history consisted of the realisation of the perfect idea, embodied in a political order, Marx and Engels (1848/1988) argued that this idea was communism, which included abolition of private property and marriage (pp. 61-62). Popper criticised this notion, saying that time is intrinsically open and history created by the decisions of human beings (1994). Interestingly, More (2001) as a utopian would seem to have agreed with the idea that human beings come before structure in achieving an ideal order, as expressed in his adage that “everything will not be done well until all men are good, and I do not expect to see that for quite a few years yet” (p. 44).

This suggests an important reflection on peace, which has been mentioned more than once in the literature: that peace in the world cannot be achieved without peace in oneself (e.g., Harris and Morrison, 2013, pp. 199, 244). The teacher, as an agent of peace education, cannot bring about peace directly, but can help their learners become peaceful – and the society to which they may make changes, and its destiny, are intrinsically open. In that sense, the analysis of whether peace

is utopia or exist in open time is directly relevant to peace education or, as Noble Prize winner Emily Green Balch (cited in Harris and Morrison, 2013) said:

We are not asked to subscribe to any utopia or to believe in a perfect new world just around the corner. We are asked to be patient with necessarily slow and groping advance on the road forward, and to be ready for each step ahead as it becomes practicable. We are asked to equip ourselves with courage, hope, readiness for hard work and to cherish large and generous ideals. (p. 181)

This suggests, in summary, that peace as per peace education does not educate towards a utopia outside of the person, but sees the person as an intrinsic end in itself, much as Kant (1788/1996), in the *Critique of Practical Reason* argued that every human being is an end in itself, being “the subject of the moral law, which is sacred, through the autonomy of his freedom” (p. 210). This idea is also in line with this study’s original problematique (Section 1.2). The peace that education educates for thus seems to be, in the words of Gur Ze’ev (forthcoming), eternal improvisation (p. 21) by the learner rather than arriving at a known end point of time (Fukuyama, 1992). While we will explore the implications of the above analysis for peace education, its learning outcomes and its assessment further in the following sections, given the special relation between utopia and time, it is of interest to note that Kelly and Kelly (2013) saw a similarly special relation between education and time:

Past, present and future merge very closely in the realm of education. The future animates education in a number of ways – education is often viewed as a vehicle for realising personal or social aspirations or potentialities. This future may be an extension of the present (a conservative approach), or a vision of a changed, better state (a progressive view). Either way, education tends to be oriented towards some idea of how things will or could be. (p. 284)

5.3 Education: Enquiries into the nature of truth

The openness that characterises ‘non-utopian’ peace it has in common with some conceptions of education, which attempt to demarcate this from adjacent concepts, such as training. According to Davis (1995) debates on this specific line of demarcation between education and training were central to education philosophy in the 1960s (p. 4). Earlier still, Dewey (1916/2011), in

Democracy and Education, contrasted education with training, which he compared with indoctrination, when arguing that: “in many cases – too many cases – the activity of the immature human being is simply played upon to secure habits which are useful. He is trained like an animal rather than educated like a human being” (p. 16, see also p. 35). However, he argued that doing so would not just be ethically wrong (especially in peace education, presumably), but also educationally defective, as in “the strict sense, nothing can be forced upon them [the learners] or into them” (p. 31) and growth “is not something done to them; it is something they do” (p. 50).

Such ideas resonate with what Davydov (1995) called Vygotsky’s third and fourth ideas, namely that the student become a ‘true subject’ in their own education and that the teacher should not “force or dictate their own will” upon them (p. 13). This suggests a link between education in general and peace education, and so it is clear, Davydov asserted, “why Vygotsky’s general ideas could not be used for such a long time in the education system of a totalitarian society – they simply contradict all of its principles” (p. 13).⁵⁵

The problematisation of education starts together with its problem of demarcation, for example, the difference between education and personal development; indoctrination; and training (on an extensive discussion of the difference between education and training, see Lum, 2009, p. 11 ff.), with the latter possibly regarded as the most important. This problem does not only arise with the practice of education – where the separation from training is of importance – but also with its study. For example, there has been discussion over whether education is an academic discipline at all. I (2010) once argued that rather than an academic discipline, education is a field of study (p. 22). The difference lies in that a discipline provides a perspective (e.g., economic, legal or sociological), which can be applied to a variety of subjects, whereas a field consists of a socially important subject, such as education or politics, which it is academically worth applying a range of perspectives to. In the case of educational studies in academia, for example, there are the areas of educational philosophy, educational sociology and, what has often been said to be the dominant discipline in education, educational psychology.

⁵⁵ It was for ideological reasons, Davydov (1995) said, that Vygotsky’s *Pedagogical Psychology* was not published in Russia until 1991 (p. 14).

These issues all get to the heart of the question: what is the object of education? And how is this object relevant to peace? More formally than Dewey, the UNESCO (2006) Thesaurus defined education as a process “by which one develops abilities, attitudes and other forms of behaviour considered to have value in the society in which one lives” (Concept 2). One would imagine that abilities, or skills, which presumably include cognitive skills, attitudes and forms of behaviour that are conducive to peace have value in our current societies – although, unfortunately, the opposite may also be the case: rather often, abilities, attitudes and forms of behaviours that are conducive to war have also (had) value in society – the Sputnik example, mentioned in Section 3.7, speaks to this.⁵⁶

However this may be, while some abilities, attitudes and forms of behaviour may require bodily coordination, according to neuroscientific insights they fundamentally reside in the human mind (which is probably why educational *psychologists*⁵⁷ such as Vygotsky, Piaget and Bruner are through to have defined this field of study to a large extent). It is thus, as the science of the mind, that education is critically essential to peace given that, as the Constitution of UNESCO (1945, see also Section 2.1) said, as “wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed” (pre-amble).

But merely to say that education is relevant to peace is not sufficient if we know that education can also be used for war-related aims; one should know what education could foster peace. For this purpose, we need a further line of demarcation: not an external one, to fence education off from training, but an internal one, to distinguish education for peace from education that is not for peace. To give an example of the latter, Plato (4th century BCE/1995), utopian and philosopher⁵⁸ devised one of the earliest surviving educational philosophies in *The Republic*,

⁵⁶ It may be considered symbolical that it has been argued that the Cold War ended because of the threat of US domination through the Strategic Defense Initiative, nicknamed Star Wars and referring to the concept of outer space, in a similar way as the Sputnik did.

⁵⁷ But according to Dewey (2011), education is born of philosophy rather than psychology – or, to be more precise, philosophy is “the theory of education in its most general phases” (p. 386). The connection is rather hard to discard, if only because of the importance of mind, knowledge and epistemology in both.

⁵⁸ Interestingly, but possibly not coincidentally, *The Republic* is about the human mind as well: in this work, Plato argued for an analogy between states of minds and government states, likening some types of mind to certain types of government (among which the democratic, the aristocratic, the autocratic, etc.).

including the outlines of a curriculum for his guardians, one of three groups of citizens of the city state (p. 57 ff). In designing this curriculum, Plato chose not only certain educational subjects for the guardians but, within these subjects, certain presentations of these with a given end. For example, he allowed some literature but prohibited other types. Depending on one's definition of peace, the objective was not for the guardians to be peaceful. Their objective was not to avoid conflict or resolve it peacefully (peace studies) but to prevail in it (war studies) – incidentally, similar to the task of the above-mentioned *kṣatriyas*.

Formal education accepts two ways of learning: through the planned and through a hidden curriculum (Print, 1993, pp. 9-10). For education to become education for peace, it would expect a description of curriculum intent (objectives or outcomes) and of teaching and learning activities, consonant with achieving peace. The most traditional form of organisation of curriculum intent and teaching and learning activities is a subject matter. From this perspective, one can either imagine education for peace to occur through a subject that engages specifically with peace as discussed in the previous section; or through existing subjects engaging with the topic of peace (Diaz et al., 1999, called these modalities a discrete, respectively an infusion approach). As to the first possibility, in the literature, peace education is considered an umbrella term (for non-violent conflict resolution; for education for sustainable development; for international or global education). As to the second option, some subjects may be more intuitive vehicles for education for peace than others; subjects such as geography and, especially, history spring to mind. After all, as Kelly (2007) said, “there is an understanding that what people remember about the past has a profound bearing upon identity and the dynamics of inter-group relations” (p. 66).

With reference to peace education as a subject, its diffuseness makes it difficult to pin down its essence and find the unifying factor in efforts understood as peace education. While Salomon (2009) conceded that peace education “has many divergent meanings for different individuals in different places” (p. 4), he added to this that “too many profoundly different kinds of activities taking place in an exceedingly wide array of contexts are all lumped under the same category of peace education as if they belong together” (p. 3). Bajaj (2008) interpreted this as Salomon and

Nevo's⁵⁹ 2002 "critique that there is confusion at the conceptual level as to what peace education is" (p. 136). In line with this, Roth (2009) argued that even "trans-national institutions such as the UNs and UNESCO which promote peace education and non-violence lack any clear definition of 'peace education'" (p. 54).

Yet on closer inspection we see that peace education, in the literature, is mainly understood in one of three ways: firstly (a) in terms of all of its social manifestations. An example of this is the broadness with which Harris and Morrison (2011) understand the field of peace education, which they define as "both a philosophy and a process involving skills, including listening, reflection, problem-solving, cooperation and conflict resolution" (p. 11). According to these authors, peace education is so broad as to even include peacekeeping, peace-making and peacebuilding (p. 18), that is to say, much of the work of the UN's 'blue helmets'. In fact, Harris and Morrison's work is permeated by the idea that peace education is rather a mind-set than anything else, as indicated, for example, by the various suggestions in their writing of 'how peace educators think' or 'what they want'.

Secondly (b), peace education is often understood in teleological terms, i.e. in terms of what it attempts to bring about; and thirdly, (c) in terms of what it intends to 'do to' learners in terms of its proposed learning outcomes. Examples of 'Type b' definitions include Reardon's (1988) understanding that it is: "educational policy, planning, pedagogy and practice that can provide learners – in any setting – with the skills and values to work towards comprehensive peace" (cited in Bajaj, 2008, p. 1). Elsewhere, similarly to the definition in the opening sentence of this thesis, that peace education denotes activities that seek to further peace through teaching and learning processes, Reardon (1982) argued that it is "learning intended to prepare the learners to contribute toward the achievement of peace" (p. 38). This is still a 'Type b' definition as, what type of learning this is, or what type of knowledge, skills or dispositions would be required for this, is not addressed in the definition.

The most frequently occurring type seem to be 'Type c' definitions, for example, Ross and Lou's (2008), who see peace education as "those initiatives that create an understanding of peace,

⁵⁹ Bajaj meant Salomon's (2002/2009) critique, published in a volume edited by Salomon and Nevo.

human rights, and global issues throughout the curriculum” (p. 4). Another example of a Type c definition is Harber and Sakade’s (2009), who initially describe peace education as aiming “to offer opportunities to develop the skills, knowledge and values required for the practice of conflict resolution, communication and co-operation in relation to issues of peace, war, violence, conflict and injustice” (p. 174). They ultimately adopt a relatively similar understanding of peace education developed by Susan Fountain for UNICEF (1999), i.e.:

Peace education in UNICEF refers to the process of promoting the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values needed to bring about behavior changes that will enable children, youth and adults to prevent conflict and violence, both overt and structural; to resolve conflict peacefully; and to create the conditions conducive to peace, whether at an intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup, national or international level. (p. 1)

Interestingly, definitions in terms of what peace education does in terms of ‘process’, pedagogy or activities (its curriculum), which we could call Type d definitions, are hard, even impossible to find. This suggests a gap if education for peace should not only work through content, but also form. Incidentally, for Dewey (2011), there was a unity between method and content; he argued that education in terms of method is the natural way for subject matters to present themselves to someone who is new to the subject (pp. 76, 194). Less abstract is the key idea of Montessori who argued that, given the parallels between a classroom setting and society (or, I would say, the symbiotic relation between society and education), the appearance of an authoritative didactic figure in the classroom as a teacher would prepare the learners to obey a dictator (Duckworth, 2008; Harris, 2008a, pp. 17-18).

While an authoritative teacher could be a threat to peace, and Montessori (2008) argued that the conflict between adult and child is the origin of all wars (p. 19), according to Latham and Vogt (2007), failure to manage challenges to classroom discipline is one of the main reasons teachers leave the profession prematurely. This can be interpreted as an absence of peace as St. Augustine (Augustinus, 2007) defined it: as tranquillity, referring to a *pater familias* whom the members in the household obey (p. 961). In addition, without order it is difficult for education to result in learning (Omomia and Omomia, 2014, p. 311). Although discipline and order are ambiguous concepts in education, there appears to be a bidirectional relation between order and effective instruction: without order, there can be no instruction at all, but ineffective instruction can lead to

lowered motivation and, finally, decreased order (yet, effective instruction does not itself rule out the necessity for effective classroom management, p. 310). Establishing order is thus a peace effort of its own kind. In this sense, peace education is almost intrinsically pedagogy⁶⁰ and has the potential to make an important contribution to education in general.

5.4 Learning outcomes: The basis of assessment

While to understand education it may not be necessary to understand the curriculum, in the sense of a syllabus or programme of study, it certainly is crucial for understanding any educational subject. In fact, one may argue that without a curriculum an educational subject cannot exist. According to Bobbitt (1918), etymologically, this word – curriculum - is related to the word ‘course’ (in terms of an educational course, on a subject) which, itself, is related to the word course in terms of a race course, and to the Latin verb of ‘to run’. While emphasising that the word curriculum has different meanings, UNESCO (2012) understands this as “a systematic and intended packaging of competencies (i.e. knowledge, skills and attitudes that are underpinned by values) that learners should acquire through organised learning experiences both in formal and non-formal settings” (p. 30). Thus, it can be considered the operationalisation of education in the context of a specific subject as understood above.

In its nuances, the understandings of curriculum distinguish between the intended or official curriculum; the actual, or implemented curriculum, that is to say, the mentioned “intended curriculum ... altered through a range of complex classroom interactions”; as a variation on the actual one, the achieved curriculum, being that “what can be assessed and can be demonstrated as learning outcomes/learner competencies”; and, finally, the hidden curriculum, referring to “unintended development of personal values and beliefs of learners, teachers and communities; unexpected impact of a curriculum; unforeseen aspects of a learning process” (UNESCO, 2012, Technical Note VIII.1). In probably one of the most well-known definitions, former Director of

⁶⁰ For example, by making process the main subject of a given class. See Allport (1979, Ch. 30) for an interesting, related discussion on catharsis.

the UNESCO International Bureau of Education (IBE), Braslavsky (undated) defined curriculum as:

The existing contract between society, the State and educational professionals with regard to the educational experiences that learners should undergo during a certain phase of their lives. For the majority of authors and experts, the curriculum defines: (i) why; (ii) what; (iii) when; (iv) where; (v) how; and (vi) with whom to learn. Using educational concepts, we can say that the curriculum defines the educational foundations and contents, their sequencing in relation to the amount of time available for the learning experiences, the characteristics of the teaching institutions, the characteristics of the learning experiences, in particular from the point of view of methods to be used, the resources for learning and teaching (e.g. textbooks and new technologies), evaluation and teachers' profiles. (p. 1)

While, over time, curriculum has been defined in a number of ways (see Print, 1993, pp. 8-9 for a range of definitions) most curricula will at least describe the content of an educational programme; pedagogy or method; and assessment, in relation to a time sequence. This implies that education is a process which may still have intrinsic value, but is also one leading to educational goals. Such educational goals are called 'learning objectives' or 'learning outcomes', which are, in turn, defined as the things a learner should know or be able to do at the end of an educational unit. They are usually the attainment of certain knowledge or the achievement of certain skills in relation to a subject matter. Of course, these designations are subject to dispute; for example, knowledge, as a learning outcome, can as well be denoted as a cognitive skill.⁶¹ Again, the achievement of a learning outcome suggests its assessability, which requires a slight reformulation: for example, the learning objective 'possesses knowledge of the basic facts [when, where, who, what] of an event X' would be reformulated to 'is able to demonstrate [for example, in writing or verbally] knowledge of' (etc.).

⁶¹ This distinction in knowledge and skills is similar to that in 'know what' (propositional knowledge, or knowledge per se) and 'know how' (skills) as proposed by Ryle (cf. Stanley & Williamson, 2001, p. 411). This distinction has been challenged on the basis of the argument that to know how to do a thing (for example, ride a bicycle) can be translated into knowledge that one has to move their feet in a certain way. This said, one can argue that one may theoretically know how to do a thing, such as bungee jumping, but still not be able to do it, for example, for fear, which may be irrational and not related to propositional knowledge.

Seminal work of a team led by North American education psychologist Benjamin Bloom⁶² led to possibly the first complete taxonomy of learning outcomes, widely known as ‘Bloom’s taxonomy’, which is, albeit with variations, used to this day. Berlak (1992b), for example, argued that this “remains the most widely accepted system of classification in the field of education” (p. 17). Over a decade later, Schmeiser and Welch (2006) equally stressed a broad consensus when arguing that, while “many cognitive taxonomies ... have been developed ... Bloom’s taxonomy” is “one of the best known” (p. 316). This taxonomy has been of importance to educational development, and educational assessment in particular, in at least three ways: firstly, in its proposal of a classification of basic domains within which learning can occur and outcomes can be formulated. According to Bloom et al. (1984) education fundamentally concerns the three realms of cognitive, affective and psychomotor education (p. 7). The cognitive domain, which may also be referred to as logical, concerns intellectual operations that might be seen as associated with traditional intelligence. The affective, on the other hand, relates to what might be referred to as moral, ethical or socio-emotional development. The psychomotor domain refers to motor skills and mind-body coordination, as one may see in sports (physical education) and dance, but also in crafts and such a basic operations as eating.

Secondly, Bloom’s taxonomy contributed greatly to the more precise formulation of learning outcomes (in fact, much of Books I and II are based on empirical research of already existing learning outcomes in a wide range of study programmes) in a language that would make a common understanding of what was sought for possible and, as a corollary, to operationalise this for assessment. And thirdly, Bloom’s taxonomy, as a taxonomy, created an order within these domains (sub-classes) to which levels of difficulty⁶³ were assigned (pp. 15, 16). This last aspect had a profound consequence for educational assessment: after all, if a positive assessment could

⁶² The place of skills in educational outcomes is relatively complex. Bloom et al. developed their framework on the basis of an assumption that educational learning outcomes can be defined on the interface of some type of educational ‘content’ and some type of ‘operation’ that can be executed in relation to that content (cf. Krathwohl et al., 1964, p. 3). For example, the content may be ‘leadership of the UN’, and the operation memorisation. While Bloom et al. do not define skills as such, the suggestion is that these operations reflect skills, and so that there is such a thing as cognitive skill.

⁶³ The developmental psychology of Jean Piaget already postulated – and empirically supported – the connection between mental or cognitive development and what would seem intrinsic scales of difficulty or complexity (Gardner, 2011, pp. 20-21). That is to say, it worked out stages of the presentation of a subject matter – say, that the mental operation of memorisation precedes that of analysis in complexity – and noticed that the mind is constructed so as to ‘learn’ the former before the latter can be addressed.

be made on one level, the foregoing levels could be assumed to have been covered. In this context, it is important that, even among the domains, a hierarchy crystallised: Bloom's team started its work with a mapping of the cognitive domain, Book I. This mapped several sub-domains, such as, in ascending order, memorisation and application (lower level thinking skills); and analysis, synthesis and evaluation (higher order thinking skills).

However, the work on the affective domain (Book II), which might well be relevant to the subjects within the field of peace education, was completed only around 10 years after the publication of Book I. This time, the authorial team was led by Krathwohl (1964), and one of the first sentences of this Book indicated that it was much "less satisfied with the result" (p. v). Now, the leading principle underpinning the structure of the work was taken to be responsiveness, rather than complexity, as was the case in Book I on the cognitive domain. The sub-domains included in this work led from a basic recognition (say, awareness of...) up to internalisation, whereby, again, the lower levels or sub-domains represented the most basic levels of this domain and, conversely, the higher levels the most advanced ones. Finally, the work on Book III was never completed.

It seems fair to say that the success of Bloom's taxonomy and the extent to which this still is largely identified with its cognitive domain (Book I) is symbolic of the importance accorded to this cognitive domain: knowledge, albeit admittedly not only memorisation, but also its application, analysis and so on. This has two important consequences for conceiving of learning outcomes relevant to peace education. First, as discussed in the previous section, education for peace can occur either through subjects under the umbrella of peace education; or through any other, existing subjects. Such subjects are normally thought of as underpinned or even defined by a 'body of knowledge'; for example, specific knowledge in geometry, algebra and arithmetic for the subject of mathematics. But if peace education is an umbrella term, then relevant knowledge, from which learning outcomes could be derived would be scattered over several subjects; and if it is integrated in other subjects, then it may not be thought of as having its own body of knowledge and, consequently, learning outcomes. While this issue is surmountable if an 'essence' of peace education can be identified, a seemingly more problematic consequence of the prevalence of cognitive learning is that it is not the most relevant to peace education or, as Bar-

Tal (2009) argued, peace education pertains to “internalization of values, attitudes, skills, and patterns of behaviors” (p. 34) – in summary, non-cognitive skills.

This raises the question of what alternatives exist to Bloom’s taxonomy, and its cognitive domain in particular, when it comes to developing learning outcomes for peace education. While not identifying learning outcomes, the work of Howard Gardner (2011) has been important in that he argued that education, in Western society, overvalued cognitive intelligence (p. xxxii). According to Gardner, both conceptual and biological (neurological) research suggested that there exist seven intelligences: the logical mathematical; linguistic; visio-spatial; rhythmical; physical; intra- and interpersonal. Each of these, Gardner argued, has its own laws and is relatively independent from any other.⁶⁴ Apart from his views on domains of learning, a remark on the concept of intelligence is in order: this should not be confused with performance. Rather, intelligence is one input into performance. Or, when Kane (2006, p. 30, based on Loevinger, 1957) argues that “the meaning of the trait is given by the domain of observations over which the disposition is defined, ... trait interpretations also assume, at least implicitly, that some underlying or latent attribute accounts for the observed regularity in performance”, intelligence can be considered such an underlying attribute.⁶⁵

Other categorisations of domains within which learning outcomes for peace education may be developed include Rychen and Salganik’s (2001) key competencies as defined for the OECD; Ananiadou and Claro’s (2009) conceptualisation of 21st century skills, rooted in the domains of information; communication; and ethics and social impact (p. 8); the LMTF’s model of seven dimensions of learning (on these examples, see Section 3.2); and UNESCO’s (2015) domains for global citizenship education (p. 22), i.e. cognitive; socio-emotional; and behavioural.⁶⁶ Strictly speaking, none of these models can be considered a taxonomy, as elements are not presented in a hierarchical order. Neither have any of these models gained wide acceptance or been empirically

⁶⁴ One may think of the example of an interpersonally untalented but cognitively highly capable person. On the issue of intelligence, while erroneous, it is not uncommon to confuse this with performance.

⁶⁵ There is thus also a fundamental difference between intelligence or intrinsic aptitude (Hattie, 2003), which cannot, and skill, which can be learnt.

⁶⁶ There are problematic aspects to including behaviour in a taxonomy of learning objectives, as this is considered that through which achievement of learning is manifested, making it measurable. However, it can also be argued that a conviction that is not acted on, is empty.

validated – but, as Schmeiser and Welch (2006) argue, “no current cognitive taxonomy seems to be supported by documented validation evidence” either (p. 316). We would thus have to proceed with caution if we intended to derive learning outcomes for peace education from them.

For one type of education that has an ambiguous relation with peace education, work has been done to develop learning outcomes by Kohlberg (1981), citing Kant as a main influence (p. 7): moral education.⁶⁷ Kohlberg described five stages of moral development: punishment and obedience; naïve instrumental hedonism; good relations and approval; law and order/democratic contract; and, finally, individual principles of conscience, and developed test items to assess development stage (e.g., p. 11). In *The Meaning and Measurement of Moral Development* he explained his assumptions, including that of ego and “the assumption of stages”, forming: “(1) an invariant sequence of (2) hierarchical transformation, which are (3) structured wholes” (p. 3). This has important consequences, including that, once a stage is reached, regression, in theory, is not possible; as well as that “no stage will be omitted as development proceeds” (p. 32). Important here is that, in Kohlberg’s view, “moral reasoning is a cognitive competence, necessary but not sufficient for given kinds of motivation and conduct” (p. 6) and that Kohlberg, similar to Kant, made a difference between moral reasoning and moral action, indicating that both belong to the realm of morality (p. 35).

While the connection between moral education and peace education is not clear, both would seek to avoid a situation where a scientifically and technologically advanced country, with highly educated people, could follow a course of action that is morally erroneous. With relevance to this scenario, to prepare for this main study, I conducted a pilot study into how holocaust education practitioners believed that achievement in their field may be assessed (Note 11). This suggested the existence of three levels of learning outcomes: first, a level of general knowledge related to the Holocaust; for example, chronological facts, but also what the consequences would be for a German soldier if she or he disobeyed orders. On the second level, affective outcomes, for example, manifested through engaging or not in bullying behaviour. On the third level, the practitioners seemed to see an existential outcome; that the programme would change a person. This level was not clearly defined, at the time, but it is interesting to see that Kelly and

⁶⁷ Moral education is often associated with character education (Althof & Berkowitz, 2006) and values education.

Fetherston (2008), in their discussion of peace education learning outcomes, similarly referred to knowledge, firstly; the task “to develop the qualities that will make possible critical forms of ‘acting’ in the often unknowable, uncertain contexts of peacework” (p. 99), secondly; and finally “to meaningfully engage the student’s self or being in the process of learning, in order that they become critical *persons*” [emphasis in the original] (p. 100).

Incidentally, addressing Bloom’s taxonomy (pp. 57-59), Stenhouse (1976) argued that, at times, learning outcomes should not be defined at all. According to Stenhouse, education consists of “at least four processes ... *training, instruction, initiation, and induction*” (p. 80). While not focusing on initiation, and while admitting that he believed the learning ‘outcomes model’ to provide a good fit for training and instruction, he argued it does not for induction in knowledge. According to him, induction in knowledge is “*successful to the extent that it makes the behavioural outcomes of the students unpredictable*” [all Italics in original] (p. 82). However, in strict rigour this unpredictability can itself be considered a learning outcome. Suggesting that the ‘essay’ is the assessment tool par excellence, Stenhouse argued this should be “individual and creative” (p. 82), but such criteria can be included in a rubric. Finally, while Stenhouse argued that knowledge “is primarily concerned with synthesis” (p. 83), Bloom’s taxonomy already included synthesis as a level of the cognitive domain. Thus, Stenhouse’s critique did not invalidate the necessity or validity of learning outcomes, or at least not that of ‘curriculum intent’ (Print, 1993), although it did underline the importance of non-standardised assessment.

While, for now, we cannot say which of these repertoires of taxonomies of learning objectives is most relevant to peace education, we do note that there have been attempts at their integration: for example, through the concept of competencies. As Rojas (forthcoming) argued, this concept was developed in the United States, in the post-war era, to assess persons’ aptness to do certain types of work (p. 4) and first appeared in White (1959). While it originally referred to aptness per se, it is now usually regarded as the sum of one’s knowledge, skills and dispositions to take on ‘complex tasks’ (see also Rychen and Salganik’s definition in Section 3.5). So here we find that learners can mobilise elements from all of Bloom’s domains, or other domains. Similarly, the work on affective skills is promising for developing learning objectives for peace education (see Harris, 2008b). Increasing the importance of this domain of learning may help avoid

situations where, as Dewey (2011) argued “the acquiring of information and of technical intellectual skills do not influence the formation of a social disposition, ordinary vital experience fails to gain in meaning, while schooling, in so far, creates only ‘sharps’ in learning – that is, egoistic specialists” (p. 10).

5.5 *Peace education and its assessment*

The science of educational assessment is concerned with the development, implementation and analysis of findings of educational tests of any type (standardised tests, essays, observations) to capture and report on the presence of knowledge, skills, abilities, capacities, dispositions, competences, attitudes and beliefs, in summary, learning outcomes as discussed in the previous section, discernible as traits: “a disposition to behave or perform in some way in response to some kinds of stimuli or tasks, under some range of circumstances” (Brennan, 2006, p. 30). While we might distinguish between educational assessment and educational measurement, the American Council on Education, which periodically publishes its handbook on *Educational Measurement*, does not do so. However, in as far there exists any difference, it is certainly not sufficient to speak of a “paradigm shift”, as Gipps (2003) did, “from psychometrics to a broader model of educational assessment” (p. 1). Still, we can interpret this, and similar views (e.g., Berlak, 1992a) as manifestations of a perception of educational assessment as narrow, and of a desire to find different, creative and more valid ways of assessing learning achievement (e.g., Bilagher, 2004). This would certainly be welcomed by Bar-Tal (2009) for peace education, who argued that usual tests are not suitable to capture outcomes for this (p. 34), as these outcomes tend to be non-cognitive.

Educational measurement itself may be equated with psychometrics, considered as the science of psychological measurement. In *sensu stricto* educational measurement and psychometrics rely on a research method known as a test (Robson, 2002, p. 292 ff). These are tools that consist of items (e.g., free form, constructed response or multiple choice) to generate a sample of observations, which are used to calculate an observed score that can, in turn, lead to trait interpretation through a metric. Given the requirement that such scores correctly reflect achievement, validity and

reliability are two main concerns in educational measurement (Brennan, 2006). While validity theory is concerned with the extent to which tests measure the target construct (see Kane, 2006, for a detailed review), reliability relates to the extent to which tests generate stable results over time, and is rooted in generalisability theory. This points to the probabilistic roots of educational measurement. These issues have come to be seen through two main lenses, over the years: classical test theory, or CTT, which starts from the premise that there exists a true score and an observed score and, consequently, an error term on each test; and item response theory (IRT) which expanded test theory in attributing characteristics to test items, for example, difficulty, discrimination, differential scoring (DIF) by groups, etc.

It is important, however, to signal that the concept of a test is broader than a standardised test only. A test may well be an essay test, or a performance (driving, a concert, an athletic competition), for example; the defining characteristic of a test is that it measures a specific type of trait that we can refer to as achievement. In this regard, I diverge from Robson, who distinguished between attainment⁶⁸ tests, such as educational achievement tests, on the one hand and attitude tests (not to be confused with aptitude tests), on the other. These are different in that the first type of instrument measures an ability or skill. Therefore, it includes correct and incorrect answers. On the other hand, attitudes are not, in general, considered skills or abilities. Attitudinal tests do not have, per se, correct or incorrect responses to items – only those that suggest or not the presence of a trait. For this reason, I do not refer to them as tests. Incidentally, confusingly, achievement tests are also used to measure aptitude (and, indeed, psychometrics is often said to originate with intelligence testing). It is important to emphasise the difference: intelligence, or intrinsic aptitude, is nowadays understood as one factor to explain achievement of learning, along with others, such as motivation (see previous section) or, in the words of Cronbach (1960), a:

... test is referred to as an achievement test when it is used primarily to examine the person's success in past study, and as an aptitude test when it is used to forecast his success in some future course of assignment. (p. 31, cited in Schmeiser & Welch, 2006, p. 308)

⁶⁸ In strict rigour, in education statistics attainment refers to attainment of educational level, whereas achievement refers to achievement of learning outcomes.

How to conceptualise a test for peace education depends, essentially, on two variables: first, which trait is to be tested (i.e. achievement of which learning outcome is to be assessed). Secondly, for what purpose it will be used (see Section 2.2). Even when the test is technically sound, if there is a mismatch between test and purpose, the net effect of assessment can be at variance with the purpose of making the world a “better, more human place” (Bar-Tal, 2009, p. 28). This question of purpose must be supplemented with the consideration of who will be assessed; this can be the learner, surely, but also the teacher (and these roles can change – one’s learner one day can be one’s teacher another), a school or, as is the case in international assessments, entire education systems. If we look again at Black’s (1998) categories (cited in Newton, 2007), namely assessment in “support of learning”; “for review, transfer and certification”; “for accountability to the public” (p. 154) as well as educational research, then none of these purposes seem intrinsically off-limits for peace education.

The question of traits to assess is, of course, crucial; it was discussed at various places in this thesis and specifically connects with the previous discussion on learning outcomes. As mentioned earlier, theory here is scarce: of the sets of learning objectives discussed (Krathwohl et al.’s affective outcomes; Ananiadou and Claro’s 21st century skills; Kohlberg’s moral education), none have a solid measurement theory. Kohlberg’s test of moral stage development is based on three hypothetical dilemmas, which differentiate between content (what is the right thing to do) and structure (why is it the right thing to do, in a given situation). The findings from the pilot study, on the other hand, suggested a number of ways to assess learning outcomes in holocaust education. There was little discussion of how achievement of learning outcomes at the first level (knowledge related to the Holocaust) could be assessed, as cognitive measurement techniques already exist. For the second level (affective outcomes), the instrument of choice was the essay. As discussed in Section 5.4, this is also Stenhouse’s preferred assessment instrument. The third level proved problematic, as some practitioners suggested this could not be measured. Other teachers mentioned a range of assessment techniques, of which some methodologically challenging, such as longitudinal studies, artistic expression and finally, simulation. However, as other practitioners argued, and as the Milgram Experiment illustrated, there are important ethical challenges to this method of measurement.

For these last two levels, and with relevance to Stenhouse's objection against precise learning objectives, one promising avenue for assessment in peace education is Lum's (2012) 'expansive assessment' (p. 597). This is assessment that does not only look at whether a person responds correctly on certain items, but also whether there is additional information on what she or he knows or can do. One can imagine an application interview, for example, where a panel assesses a candidate's fitness for a certain job and, while she certainly gives all the right answers, her unkempt presentation is not in line with what is expected for a representational task. Expansive assessment would – or does – then provide the framework for including such considerations, even if they would not have been previously articulated. There are, of course, risks to this: one may imagine a situation where the panel felt that the 'candidate' did not have 'it', but are unable to explain what 'it' is. This, i.e. the non-articulation of what in education would be learning objectives, and might be functional requirements in this example, could lead to a situation where the assessment of the panel would be perceived of as unfair. Thus, while it would enable peace education to assess peacefulness without explaining peacefulness in a set of learning objectives, it may have to be further developed to be practically useful.

Beyond theory, a notable exception to the idea that learning outcomes in peace education are not assessed, to the extent that civic and citizenship education may fall among the subjects under this umbrella, were the IEA's Civic Education Study (CIVED) and its International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS), conducted in 1999, with a predecessor in 1971 (CIVED), 2009 (Schulz et al., 2010) and 2016.⁶⁹ What is different from other international tests, such as Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), is that the assessment framework goes beyond the cognitive domain. For example ICCS, implemented in 38 countries, while including a cognitive domain, and within this, the sub-domains of "knowing" (lower order thinking skills) and "analyzing and reasoning" (higher order thinking skills), contained an even greater number of basic items (the ratio is 80:121) accorded to an "affective-behavioral domain" (p. 26), consisting of the sub-domains 'value beliefs', 'attitudes', 'behavioral intentions' and 'behaviors'.

⁶⁹ The data of ICCS 2016 will become available in November 2017.

For ICCS 2009 a ‘specification table’ or test blueprint (Note 31) was created mapping these operational domains to four content domains (cf. Krathwohl et al., 1964, p. 3), with a given number of items mapped onto the intersections of these operational and content domains, as can be seen in Figure 1 below:⁷⁰

	Content Domain				Total
	Civic society & systems	Civic principles	Civic participation	Civic identities	
Cognitive domains					
Knowing	15	3	1	0	19
Analyzing and reasoning	17	22	17	5	61
Total	32	25	18	5	80
Affective-behavioral domains[^]					
Value beliefs	12	12	0	0	24
Attitudes	12	18	18	14	62
Behavioral intentions			21		21
Behaviors			14		14
Total	24	30	53	14	121

Note: [^] The table does not include any optional student questionnaire items.

Fig. 1: ICCS 2009 specification table (Schulz et al., 2010, p. 26)

In line with what is usual in international large-scale assessments, the research instruments included not only actual tests (“international student cognitive test”), but also background questionnaires (“40-minute international student questionnaire”) to support the interpretation in the light of findings, in terms of background data. Unusually, the latter was also “used to obtain student perceptions about civics and citizenship”. While a cognitive scale was used for the cognitive test, using a Rasch model with a mean of 500 and a standard deviation of 100,⁷¹ as is usual, the latter part of the assessment used non-test survey items, which were reported on in a survey-like fashion. They included items with Likert scales⁷² such as: ‘people should be able to protest if they believe a law is unfair’ (value beliefs, p. 88, with a four point ‘agreement’-scale) or (participation in) ‘human rights organizations’ (behaviours, p. 129, with a three point

⁷⁰ As noted in Section 3.3, it must be reiterated that IEA-based studies, differently from the OECD-based PISA, developed its specification tables on the basis of curriculum analyses, while PISA based these on expert panels.

⁷¹ In addition, ICCS 2009 developed proficiency levels, which were originally norm-referenced but subsequently mapped onto the cognitive scale (p. 73), so that score levels could be related to a typical set of knowledge.

⁷² The precise formulation of the questions must, at times, be inferred from the report as they are kept confidential if they are part of the secure pool.

‘frequency-scale, consisting of: ‘within the last 12 months’, ‘more than a year ago’ or ‘never’). One consequence of the fact that these domains were not approached from a test-perspective is that there was no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answer and, consequently, no scores could be calculated. So, while one may think that from the perspective of a certain conception of ‘peace’ there exist desirable answers, ICCS 2009 did not take that position.⁷³

In relation to the issue of purpose, and who was assessed, briefly addressed above, it is of note that ICCS was sample-based and applied a balanced rotational design. To ensure wide content coverage, the number of items to be included exceeded a number that of students could be asked, and so a complex design was used, applying booklets with balanced sets of items or clusters. This refers to an important aspect of similar large-scale assessments: the unit of analysis is not the learner, but the education system. This may seem reminiscent of the ‘programme logic’ of evaluation that is so prevalent in peace education, and this is true. But let us remember that, as discussed in Section 1.2, whether an activity is evaluation largely depends on design, while whether something is assessment, largely relies on method. My criticism is that evaluations of peace education programmes do not tend to consider assessment data, i.e. that they do not use assessment techniques. This is different in ICCS: while the overall design of the study appears as an evaluation of the effectiveness of education systems to instil civic and citizenship education learning, it relies on assessment data. The instruments of ICCS could, with modifications, also be applied to assess individual learners.

A very different example is that of the recent benchmarks for religious and moral education of Education Scotland (2017). On four levels (early; one; two; and three) and in three domains (beliefs⁷⁴; values and issues; practices and traditions) these define experiences and outcomes, which are related to benchmarks, and which can be understood as means of verification for

⁷³ From a practical perspective, this might be rooted in the fact that national curricula may be too divergent or even that, when they are not, values such as ‘positive perceptions of own country’, in the context of an international assessment do not refer to the same entity. It may also be due to that this would lead to perceived desirability bias and, thus, finally, incorrect information.

⁷⁴ It is important to know how these beliefs are framed (Education Scotland, 2017, p. 6): “The ‘belief’ for consideration is likely to come from a range of sources for each religion/belief group. It may be scriptural or not and may come from a variety of genres, for example, poetry, story, music etc., and may also involve images from the religion / belief group if appropriate.” Moreover: “It is likely that ‘a belief group independent of religion’ will be, for example, Humanism. ... As learners progress through levels, it might also come to include philosophical perspectives such as utilitarianism.”

teaching practitioners. It is important to note that these domains do not relate, directly at least, to domains in the sense of Bloom's taxonomy; rather, they seem to describe a field that is approached from both a cognitive as well as an affective angle. For example, in Level 1, domain 'values and issues', there is the outcome: "Having explored stories from world religions, I can show my developing understanding of key values of those faiths and how they might be put into action in people's lives and communities" (RME 1-05a, p. 7).

While ICCS 2009 counted with a strict set of protocols, sampling designs and a secure bank of items with defined psychometric properties, based on an assessment framework, the prescription on assessment of the benchmarks seems liberal (Education Scotland, 2017, p. 2): "Evidence of progress and achievement will come from a variety of sources including: observing day-to-day learning within the classroom, playroom or working area; observation and feedback from learning activities that takes place in other environments, for example, outdoors, on work placements; coursework, including tests; learning conversations; and planned periodic holistic assessment." Thus, and in line with the type of assessment it is intended for (classroom-based assessment), the protocol is minimal. Possibly this 'light touch' can in part also be explained by the circumstance that, as Grant and Matemba (2013) remarked: "Assessment in Scottish RE – both in the denominational and non-denominational sectors (i.e. RME) – is actually a fairly recent development which emerged in 1981 after the law that had previously prevented any form of assessment in the subject was lifted"⁷⁵; before that, "RE was the only subject which by law could not be assessed" (p. 2).

These brief examples show that assessment in peace education will still require substantial groundwork, rooted in a conception of learning objectives, which, in turn, must address the question of what peace education, in essence, is. In the following chapter, we will address these issues on the basis of the applied Delphi methodology.

⁷⁵ RE denotes Religious Education; RME denotes Religious and Moral Education.

6. Data analysis

6.1 Introduction

As discussed in the Introduction (Ch. 1) and, to a greater extent, in the Methodology (Ch. 4), the objective of this study is to confirm, on the basis of expert consensus, how achievement of learning outcomes should be assessed in peace education. This question is directly related to that of what these learning outcomes are: a question that is itself complicated by the fact that there exists no unified curriculum for peace education. Moreover, peace education has sometimes been regarded as an umbrella term for a set of types of education for which no unified curriculum is possible. To address this issue preliminarily, a conceptual analysis was conducted as presented in the previous chapter. This addressed the central concepts of peace education and its assessment and helped inform the development of instruments used to seek expert consensus. It suggested that, while, even when learning objectives for peace education will have been defined, the issue of assessment will still merit analysis – however, that of learning outcomes is to be addressed first and foremost.

To elicit this expert consensus, which would crystallise in a brief document outlining principles governing assessment in peace education, a ‘statement of principles’, after careful sampling as described in Chapter 4 (Methodology), invitations were sent to the selected experts, and three rounds of Delphi implemented. The first round consisted of the administration of a questionnaire with open-ended questions, developed after the conceptual analysis (see Annex V); the second round of this Delphi consisted of a request for comments on a draft version of the statement of principles, on how to assess achievement of learning outcomes in peace education (see Annex VI); and the third, final round of this Delphi consisted of a request to the participants to indicate their agreement, whether overall (*grosso modo*) or with reservations or, finally, their disagreement with a final version of the statement of principles (see Annex VIII), as it had been developed from the feedback received on the draft version.

This chapter thus describes, first, the analyses that led to the draft statement of principles (Round 1) that was sent to the panel for comments (Round 2), where appropriate in the light of the theories, concepts and ideas addressed in the conceptual analysis. These principles are included at the end of each of the following four sections. Secondly, it addresses the analyses that led to the final statement. In terms of process, comments received on the draft statement, in Round 2, were registered, and dealt with one by one: this register is included as Annex VII. The outcome of the final Round (3) is discussed at the end of this chapter.

It should be noted that the draft version of the statement included two introductory principles (paragraphs), as follows:

1. The assessment of learning outcomes in peace education is important because it helps to: (a) assess learner progress, thus creating learning opportunities for both learners and teachers; (b) assess the effectiveness of the education initiative to achieve its intended outcomes; and (c) for research purposes. The question that is critical in educational assessment per se, i.e. assessment of whom, for whom and with what purpose is equally relevant to assessment in peace education.
2. This area touches on four main concepts: peace; education (for peace); learning outcomes (of peace education); and assessment (of the learning outcomes of peace education), which relate to each other in the given sequential order. To describe how to assess achievement of learning outcomes in peace education, define principles to be adhered to in this and to develop a paradigm, these four concepts need to be clarified.

The content of the opening paragraph was elicited from the response received through Round 1, which included a question on the function of educational assessment, Question 5. It listed three important functions of educational assessment, i.e. assess learner progress towards the learning objectives of a programme; assess whether a programme is achieving its objective; and to increase knowledge relevant to it, for example, of variability in learning achievement according to the circumstances of the learner. It also indicated the importance of the question of use of assessment information, in peace education as well as in other types of education. The second Paragraph, on the other hand, followed the structure of the questionnaire for Round 1, itself based on the conceptual analysis (Ch. 5). It outlined the main concepts delineating the domain to which the declaration pertained.

I will now proceed with the analysis of the data on the concept of peace.

6.2 Round 1: Understandings of peace

In the analysis of the respondents' views of peace, Galtung's (1975) definitions of positive and negative peace,⁷⁶ which were explicitly mentioned by some participants, albeit sometimes in a context of explicit disagreement, still proved a useful device. Roughly, three types of response were received to the question of what peace is: firstly, those that emphasised the importance of negative peace, i.e. the absence of violence; secondly, those that presented some kind of positive definition of peace; and thirdly, those that indicated that peace cannot be defined, should not be defined or did not define it for another reason. In this last category we encounter a respondent who, for pragmatic reasons, did not define peace at all (Qatar-based, British former UN official P10); one who argued that there is not one peace, but that there are many "peaces" (Austrian academic P16); and finally one who suggested that the concept of peace is not a 'state', but is best approximated by the action of peace-building, i.e. "a collective effort toward co-constructing possibility" (P8). In the case of P10, one wonders whether her thought leadership in education in emergencies is related to her pragmatism on this point.

While participant P8 emphasised that this was not a definition but a dialogic utterance, he did indicate that he sympathised with an external definition of peace as described in Article 16.f of the Earth Charter (The Earth Charter Initiative,⁷⁷ 2000):

Recognize that peace is the wholeness created by right relationships with oneself, other persons, other cultures, other life, Earth, and the larger whole of which all are a part.

Among the other two groups (consisting of those participants that emphasised the importance of negative peace and those that presented some type of positive definition of peace), there was an

⁷⁶ See the conceptual analysis (Ch. 5) for a discussion of this.

⁷⁷ This is institutionally based at the United Nations-mandated University for Peace.

extent of overlap: of the five respondents that mentioned the importance of negative peace – that is to say, peace as the absence of overt violence - for understanding peace (P3, P4, P6, P7, P9), only one said that all of peace is covered by negative peace. All but one of them either supplemented the importance of negative peace with a positive definition (P3, P7) or mentioned the importance of negative peace in conjunction with positive peace. The one participant who understood peace as negative peace only (Canadian high-level academic and former government advisor P6) stated that he thought of Galtung's definition as not very useful, as:

The absence of war, in itself, is a formidable goal (it means hundreds, thousands or millions of people who will not suffer the atrocities of a war). To demean this objective by adding a negative adjective to the word peace i[s] counter-productive.

When peace was defined positively, it was, again, defined in either of two ways: as a 'state' (of integrated being, P2; of justice, P7; of safety, P11; or of harmony, P12), or as a 'process' rather than a desired end state. In the case of one answer (Korean chief researcher P7), these two ways co-existed, although the concept of peace-as-process prevailed:

I perceive the state of being peaceful to be the absence of both direct and structural violence and oppression, or in a more positive term, the state of having justice, equity, non-violence, healthy ecology, human rights, diversity, pluralistic democracy and care for oneself and others ensured and secured in a society. While the definition as such may be organized around its "state of being" as an end product, in approaching to "peace" in my own work, I treat "peace" more as a process than the state of being to be arrived at.

In cases where peace was defined as a state, this was described in such divergent ways (as can be seen in the preceding quotation) by respondents that it was hard to understand it meaningfully. In this context, we see a parallel with some understandings referred to in the conceptual analysis. Even when the word 'state' was not explicitly used, peace was still positively understood as the equivalent of this, for example, as the "presence of trust, respect, equality and expanding social justice and inclusion" (US-based academic with a focus on conflict resolution P1) or as the "fulfilment of human rights" (Israeli academic and activist P5). And similarly to how P7 added several other positive characteristics to her definition of peace as a state of justice (see quotation above), thus another participant added several positive characteristics to his definition of peace

as a state of harmony, namely as: “equity and fairness within and between individuals, groups and institutions” (Nigerian academic P12).

At first sight, it seemed difficult to find any common denominator to such a wide range of ‘things’ peace was thought of as. Yet, with very few if any exceptions, all things that peace were thought of as, were *relational* – describing an organisation of a relation between self and others, self and nature, and even self and self. For example, harmony was harmony in a relation between self and others, or also self and self; justice, a principle organising a relation between self and others; safety referring to a freedom from vulnerability or risk, again in a relation; trust, respect and equality all existing only in relations. Without an ‘object’, a ‘subject’ cannot trust or respect – there has to be an object of these things, even if that is one self.

It was thus of interest to note that the definition of peace as per the Earth Charter, referred by P8 (above) as well as by one additional respondent (US-based former administrator P13), as “the wholeness created by right *relationships* with oneself, other persons, other cultures, other life, Earth, and the larger whole of which all are a part” (emphasis mine), suggested exactly this: that peace is about relations. But while one part of that relation – one’s self – seemed clearly defined, did our respondents agree with the openness towards the objects of relations that can be encompassed for peace, reflected in the Earth Charter? This question can be answered affirmatively for the first relation that the Earth Charter mentioned: that with oneself. This was referred to by several respondents as either internal or inner peace. In the words of one participant: “Internally peace is a state of integrated being” (US-based academic with a focus on philosophy of education P2). The German religious leader P14 argued that, without inner peace, world peace is ‘abstract’. Similarly, P1 said that (presumably ‘external’) peace is connected with inner peace.

Including peace with other, non-human life in this understanding seemed more controversial. Certainly, according to one respondent (Congolese education practitioner and activist P11): “Peace can also be defined in the context of the environment. We are at peace if our environment is safe because we get more from it, like air, food and tools to use in our daily life.” This seemed to contradict a point in the literature that peace education tends to be anthropocentric (Hung,

2007). Another participant argued that peace is, *in essence*, peace with nature (German religious leader P14) and went so far as to mention peace education for animals. This however contrasted strongly with a view of another participant, to whom the idea of animal rights was upsetting in the light of broad human suffering (P5). This position was interesting given her broad experience in peace education among Israelis and Palestinians. As this was a tension I could not solve immediately, I will return to it in more detail, below.

The counterpart for peace that was least controversial was, explicitly or implicitly, other groups, such as women, children and refugees (Israeli academic and activist P5). The identification of group relations as object of peace connected well with Salomon's (2009) view from the literature that peace in the context of peace education addresses conflict between groups, rather than interpersonal conflict (see also Harris, 2008b, p. 249). While in the only case where groups were mentioned explicitly, individuals were, too (Nigerian academic P12), the numerous references to social justice, structural violence and human rights (i.a. P1, P2, P7, P9) clearly pointed to peace in terms of relations between groups. That is to say, from any of these perspectives (social justice, human rights and the prevention of structural violence), it may be justified if a person X gets paid less for work Y, but it is in principle not justified if, overall, a group of persons X's gets paid less for work Y if their membership of that group is not relevant to their ability to do it. Or: one may not like person X, but not because she or he is part of group Y. If this were the case, we would face a structural injustice, and thus structural violence. If the injustice is individual, this may still be a case of violence, but not one of structural violence.

This notion that peace is, in the first place, relational, was supplemented by positive definitions as 'open-ended' or a 'process'⁷⁸ rather than a state. This was, again, in line with a thought from the conceptual analysis, where we saw that peace tends to be non-utopian, with all that implies. It was thus striking that one participant (US-based academic and former administrator P13) used this same expression:

⁷⁸ This of course led to fertile possibilities to connect the concept of peace with that of education, which is itself considered a process – a connection that will be further discussed, later on.

This definition [the one from the Earth Charter, see above] also connotes peace as a very active, ongoing process – rather than a utopian end state and also hints to the fact that pursuit of peace is multidimensional, comprehensive, and holistic.

The implications of this are complex. In the conceptual analysis, I briefly touched upon the difficulties associated with a conception of peace as utopian. If peace was utopian and if, as per a historicist perspective, it was the necessary outcome of human history, then, as Popper (1994) said, everything that stands between the now and peace, for example capitalism in the opinion of Marx, could legitimately be eliminated (p. 50). This, of course, creates a conundrum, in as far as ‘elimination’ is not an activity that is most often associated with peace or peacefulness. Fukuyama (1992), who criticised Marx just as Popper did, but tried to beat him at his own game in that he used historicism to prove that liberal democracy rather than communism constituted the utopian ‘end of history’ ran into the same difficulty: the implication of a utopia is, after all, that time ends; there is nothing to improve, so there is no need for history to continue.

While the notion that peace be understood as a process would overcome this dilemma, it was not directly clear how this could then be imagined. Fortunately, two participants gave clues to solve this. P3, firstly, referred once more to Galtung (1967), and the fact that he asserted that positive peace is made out of ‘positive relations’ – note the similarity to the ‘right relations’ in the Earth Charter – of which one is justice, which he (Galtung) defined as synonymous with ‘equality’ (p. 15). Similarly, in addition to defining peace as the fulfilment of human rights, P5 associated this with equality, albeit “in a practical sense rather than a legal frame”. This helped clarify how to perceive of positive peace as a process: equality, understood as the main form of justice, is not a state, or at least not only a state, but also a process. It is something that can be done, enacted in concrete instances on a more or less continuous basis. So, peace as process are then all the things that are done, and decisions taken, to further the principle of fundamental equality of human beings and, even more so, of human groups. This, for peace, is axiomatic: ‘right relations’ are relations of fundamental equality.

The two main notions emanating from this analysis so far, namely (a) that peace is relational and (b) that equality – in strict rigour: same-ness – has a critical part to play in it, in that this is justice or a right relation, led me to a speculation in line with the Earth Charter (16.f): that the relation

of equality is not only one of equivalence, although it is also that, but one of actual identity. That is to say that peace is, ultimately, about a realisation of the ‘One-ness’ of the world, of the Other not only as interconnected with one, but as one-self; that circumstances like different gender, physical traits and religion do not fundamentally distinguish one person from another – whereas, paradoxically, individual traits do. If this speculation were correct this would have consequences for the understanding of the fundamental aim of peace education: *the realisation*⁷⁹ *that this is the case*. That is to say, knowledge of others would lead to an understanding of One-ness and thus one’s selves identity with Others.

So while some elements from the conceptual analysis were found back in this analysis, some others, such as the references to religion, were not.

This analysis, in Round 1, was translated to Paragraph 3 of the first draft of the statement of principles, as follows:

3. Peace is the central concept of peace education, and an understanding of this is critical to it. In this regard, both negative peace (absence of violence) and positive peace (presence of justice) are important. While positive peace is more complex to define, there is consensus that it is open-ended, rather than a utopian end-state. It can, to some extent, be equated with justice, which can, to some extent, be equated with equity.⁸⁰

It should be noted that, in the draft statement, the relationality of peace was not yet mentioned. After receiving feedback, in Round 2, this was corrected.

I will now proceed with the analysis on peace education.

6.3 Round 1: Understandings of peace education

⁷⁹ Note, here, that the word ‘realisation’ is ambiguous: it denotes, on the one hand, awareness and, on the other, enactment.

⁸⁰ For precision of terminology, in a subsequent draft the word ‘equity’ was changed to ‘equality’.

At first sight, the views of the experts of what peace *education* is (or should be), mirrored the issue described in the Introduction: that it was ‘something’ – a process, project, or programme – that should bring ‘something else’ about, whereby the first something (let us say the independent variable, IV, or factor) X was not further defined, but the second thing (the dependent variable DV, or outcome, product or result) Y was peace. And in understanding peace, at least, Galtung’s definitions could be used. This, of course, related exactly to the initial problem underpinning this study: that, while there might have been consensus on what peace education should ultimately do, there was still no consensus on what its identity, its core, that is to say, its curriculum should be. Thus, peace education itself remained somewhat of a black box.

Consequently, peace education was often simply defined as a process to bring about peace, without specifying what this process should consist of. For example, one participant (US-based academic P1) argued that: “Peace education embraces activities and curriculum that make our schools more peaceful within, and empowers them to contribute to peace in their global and local communities”. This definition said what peace education was supposed to ultimately do, but not how it was supposed to do this, and thus, what it is. This appeared to be the fundamental challenge for peace education: it was considered ‘education for peace’, but what kind of education this is, tended not to transpire. To give a clear example of this (Congolese education practitioner and activist P11): “Peace education is a process through which we can educate our children, or the community on ways to live in harmony with the people around us, and the environment around us”.

There were, however, three variations to this theme⁸¹ that helped understand the concept of peace education to a greater extent. The first of these took an intermediate step between education and its intended outcomes. For example (P7, the Korean chief researcher):

Education for peace is a kind of education (or any education) that encourages and facilitates the learners to develop their life-long commitments to the values of, and actions for, peace (as defined above) and their enduring capacities to materialize such commitments.

⁸¹ Please note that this terminology (key idea, theme) is in line with the analytical strategy as laid out in the Methodology (Ch. 4).

So here we still had the final aims of education – “peace (as defined above)” – but also the intermediate outcome of equipping learners with such skills, dispositions and abilities as to bring peace about, i.e. the development of their “commitments” to values and their “capacities” (abilities, skills) to give substance to these commitments. This was, in a way, a step beyond the issue of peace education into that of peace education learning outcomes and even accompanied by a ‘mini-taxonomy’, where such objectives were thought of as having one affective, or value-related component (commitments) and one skills-related one. In addition, a relation was laid out between these, where one was configured as the enabler of the other. This shift was fundamental: in line with the *problematique* discussed in the Introduction, the emphasis was not anymore on the wider environment, or even the school, but on learners; thus, we could move, finally, from a ‘programme logic’ to an educational one.

In summary, this three-step configuration, of X (education) leading to Y (peace) by means of Z (given learning outcomes) was a step forward on the IV (independent variable) → DV (dependent variable) or ‘an X [whatever X means] leading to Y’-logic in that it moved the focus to learners. A similar pattern appeared more than once in responses, for example (P12): “Peace education is [X] the process of acquiring [Z] knowledge, skills and dispositions that empowers individuals, groups and institutions to [Y] resolve conflicts harmoniously and fairly”; or (P13): “Peace education [X] prepares and nurtures learners with [Z] the knowledge, skills, capacities and attitudes necessary to [Y] critically understand, confront and end violence, war and injustice and promote a culture of peace.”

Only very few experts gave substance to the ‘X’: peace education. For example, and even though technically speaking the learners were not mentioned here (P4): “peace education is [X] *teaching and learning processes* (including formal and non-formal) and practices that foster [Z] knowledge, attitudes and behaviours that support the realization of [Y] peace” (emphasis mine). This additional step was crucial to understand the essence of peace education in a number of respects. The ‘thin’ XYZ-configuration (where peace education was mentioned, but not yet defined), which we noted in the previous paragraphs, already established the primacy of the learner before the subject – that is to say, it clarified that peace education is about learners before

being about peace. This is what sets it apart from, for instance, peace studies, of which the primary focus is on peace.

The ‘thick’ XYZ-configuration, on the other hand, where peace education is defined as teaching and learning processes, went at least one step further: in line with the Deweyan notion that education is not just, and not even mainly about outcomes but also about process, this suggested that it is more than (achieving) its learning objectives; it is, in one way or another, a type of engagement. This then led to a demarcation line between what is an educational experience for peace and what is any other ‘peace-related’ experience: it has to be an engagement of a learner. By this criterion, for example, the South-African Truth Commission might be a peace-related process, but not a peace education one (although some literature says otherwise – for example, Enslin, 2002/2009). What we would, on the other hand, classify as education would be experiences such as those stipulated in Allport’s (1979) chapter on contact, in his *The Nature of Prejudice* (Ch. 30), which were later called ‘Contact Hypothesis’ or ‘Contact Theory’, and of which social travel is an example.⁸² According to this theory, if certain conditions are in place, contact with members of another group can lead to greater appreciation of that group.

This seemed to be a valuable form of peace education process given an additional consideration related to it, which was relevant to the mentioned distinction between ‘education as process towards’ something (Y or Z) and education as process *tout court*: that it be open-ended. Thus, similar to how peace that was a ‘state’ might be a utopia that could be indistinguishable from dystopia: “[w]hile the key desired areas of learning or learners’ attributes can be rather clearly defined, the learning process and the forms of manifestations of such learnings could be open-ended” (Korean chief researcher P7). This echoed P13’s point that, as peace education must not follow the same method as education that seeks war, peace education must not become indoctrination. Similarly, another respondent (US-based academic with a focus on international and multicultural education P9) argued that: “While educational spaces can be used to foster values like war, violence, competition, militarism, and hatred, it can also be used to develop capacities for peace, nonviolence, justice, dignity and respect for difference.”

⁸² Allport (1979) described some further examples of this under the name of ‘intercultural education’ (p. 264).

This note was left like a prescription, from the definition of what peace education is, for the next step, in which we will examine learning objectives, and related to Dewey's distinction between being educated like a human being and trained like an animal (see Section 5.3). As Lum (2009) reminded us, the word training, and the concept of vocational skills had at times been used in a political manner, so as to attribute higher value to the liberal arts and education than the presumably manual labour associated with training and vocational capability. Surely, associating training with the state of being an animal is at odds with Lum's analysis – especially as Lum saw this in the light of the “metaphysical complexity of human action” (p. 190). Lum even refuted the notion that education has a more favourable relation to morality than training (on the contrary, he argued that, while education is ‘for one’, training tends to be ‘for others’, p. 187). To interpret Dewey's statement correctly, it should probably be assumed that Dewey referred to a specific type of training. I shall return to this issue, once more, below.

Going to the heart of the issue of lack of curriculum, in this discussion, it was mentioned that there exist several different types of peace education (global citizenship education, human rights education, non-violent conflict resolution), so that it was not clear what type of education fundamentally peace education is. However, one was mentioned more than others, almost as a universal archetype of peace education: (global) citizenship education (e.g., the Colombian academic P3). As one respondent (P5) said: “I define peace education [as] global education oftentimes.” While this participant stressed the global dimension of global citizenship education (GCED), others emphasised the element of citizenship education, for example (Austrian academic P16): “The same as for peace applies for peace education, a contested term, differently interpreted. I personally believe that peace education is a kind of citizenship education focussing on (detecting, criticising and overcoming) violence.” Similarly, P2 (the US-based academic with a focus on philosophy of education) argued that: “Peace education is a learning process designed to develop the capacity of global citizens to critically understand and transform all forms of violence and the patterns of thought that justify and support them in order to contribute to the creation of a more just and peaceful world.” In many cases, we found that peace education is, somehow, connected with global issues.

If we accept the common denominator of peace education as ‘education for peace’, which seems to emerge from the above analysis, in combination with the definition of peace as relational, and mainly addressing inter-group issues, it would seem that some lines of demarcation of which subjects fall under the umbrella of peace education could be drawn up. For example, education for sustainable development would not be a manifestation of peace education, as it does not by definition deal with differences between groups, whereas the following seem to belong to it, to a greater or lesser extent: global citizenship education; civic and citizenship education; holocaust education / genocide education; inter-cultural education; international education; sexuality education; and religious education.⁸³

This is described in the table below:

Type	Main focus
Global citizenship education (GCED)	What it means to be a ‘global citizen’ – knowledge of how the world defines groups
Civic education	Knowledge of other groups in society
Holocaust education / genocide education	Knowledge of Jewish culture and history / knowledge of historical genocides
Inter-cultural education	Knowledge of other cultures
International education	Knowledge of other countries
Sexuality education	Knowledge of other gender(s)
Religious education	Knowledge of other religions

Tab. 3: Types of peace education

Incidentally, while GCED has been said to suffer from a lack of definition (Chung and Park, 2016, p. 18), this is not necessary. I argued elsewhere (Bilagher, 2015b) that GCED can be

⁸³ Note that these are relatively generic indications. For example, in the field of religious education, Maudarbox (2016) created a distinction between religious education and inter-religious education. He also observed that inter-cultural education is often thought of as the same as multicultural education, where the former expression is used more commonly in continental Europe and the latter in the English-speaking world, but argued that they represent different concepts (p. 461).

considered as national citizenship education where the frame of reference is ‘transposed’ from the national to the global level (see also Wintersteiner et al., 2015, p. 4). There are some differences between these. For example, whereas the borders of nation-states may be considered artificial constructs, or institutional, rather than brute facts, as Searle (1969) might say (cited in Lum, 2009, p. 76), those of the planet – the entity addressed by the Earth Charter – are real, or brute facts, both in terms of space and in terms of the availability of resources. In addition, whereas the rules of living together within the national, or state-based frame of reference are mainly determined by law, in the other, global area, there may be no existing positive law, so that here ethics become the main toolbox to regulate behaviour.

These differences can be illustrated with the help of the following table:

	GCED	Citizenship education
Social framework	Peace	Order
Moral framework	Ethics	Law
Group framework	Humanity	Nationality (passport)
Geographical framework	Planet	National territory (borders)

Tab. 4: The difference in foci between global and national citizenship education, based on Bilagher (2015b)

In summary, as in the case of the conceptual analysis, definitions of peace education in terms of process were few. Still, differently from the conceptual analysis, support was found for the idea that, as opposed to peace studies, in peace education, the learner is more important than peace. It also seems that we can maintain the conception of peace education as an umbrella term for types of education (i.e. types of engagement for learners), as noted in the conceptual analysis (Ch. 5) but only – and this is different from the view in the conceptual analysis – in as far as they meet a number of criteria. Mainly, these subjects should centre on differences and commonalities between groups; that is to say, on identities and diversity. GCED is identified as a form of typical peace education because it frames these different groups as belonging to one entity – the ‘globe’

– and the knowledge and understanding of them as necessary for a new identity of global citizen, which itself transcends ‘non-global’ identities.

This led to Paragraphs 4, 5 and 14, as follows:

4. This evokes the fundamental subject of peace education: inter-group peace, which, in turn implies equivalence, and thus unity in diversity. That is to say that, although human beings show a surprising range of diversity, we are equivalent as there is a One-ness underlying human existence, as per Plato’s cave allegory.

5. Similarly to peace, education is open-ended. In the context of peace education, it is more than outcome; it is process, too, consisting of elements of both teaching and learning. Peace is a social construct, and requires human beings to both materialise – give- and perceive – receive - peace. Human beings are thus central to peace, and education is central to human life, or, in the words of Dewey: “Education is not preparation for life, it is life itself”.

14. Peace education relates to self and other(s) on a group level and can be perceived as a broad umbrella term, which denotes kinds of education focusing on inter-group peace. Such groups can be defined in a number of ways, including ethnic, religious and socio-economic, but also gender. This thus includes international education, religious education, civic and citizenship education and even sex education. In this sense, global citizenship education can be considered the archetypal peace education.

I will now proceed with the analysis of the data on learning outcomes of peace education.

6.4 Round 1: Understandings of learning outcomes in peace education

So far, we have found that peace, in the context of peace education, is relational and open-ended and peaceful relations are, in essence, relations of equality, especially of groups; and that peace education is a type of engagement with a learner in respect of peace, which gives primacy to the learner, and where the focus is on group diversity and identities. These views and, in particular, the notions that, in peace education, learners and learning come before peace and thus peace education’s main focus is not on peace but on a skills-set for the learner as peace-maker, were re-confirmed in the discussion of learning outcomes in peace education. For example, in addressing

learning outcomes one respondent (US-based academic with a focus on philosophy of education P2) specifically argued that: “Outcomes should focus on the development of capacities—capacities of critical thinking, inquiry, reflection, etc. as well as the development of a sense of justice.” This particular view was possibly most crucially formulated by P13 (the US-based academic and former administrator), and it is worth to quote at some length:

I think it’s important to distinguish between social purposes of education and learning outcomes. Social purposes are those conditions in society that education seeks to maintain, change or transform. The social purposes of peace education – nurturing a culture of peace – are rather open ended. Learning outcomes, on the other hand, I see as more specific and rooted in the development of fundamental capacities or competencies seen as necessary for personal, social and political engagement. The learning outcomes of peace education need to be well defined for the learning to be intentional and potentially transformative.

While programme evaluation in peace education tends to assess the achievement of the *social purpose* of peace education, which is peace (and in practice, often understood as negative peace), only educational assessment [or measurement] can help evaluate the achievement of its *learning outcomes*. This illustrates why the gap identified in the literature review (see Ch. 3) is a real gap: for as long as peace education programmes are evaluated, but not assessed, the achievement of the social purpose would be considered the outcome of peace education, rather than its learning outcomes, that is to say, changes in learners. Seen in this way, however, peace education is not necessarily education. It is a development intervention. The differentiation articulated by P13 made it possible to think of learning outcomes in other terms than peace; for example, in terms of ‘peace knowledge’, ‘peace skills’ and ‘peace dispositions’ – without prejudice to whether these really are skills, knowledge (and of what type) or dispositions.

This shift from *evaluating* peace to *assessing* peace education learning outcomes also helps solve another issue: that of tension between individual and collective in assessing achievement. With this, it became clear that peace education learning outcomes are individual outcomes. This tension was also found in the literature, specifically, with Kohlberg (1981). Some participants (e.g. Colombian academic P3) similarly discussed the extent to which peaceful behaviour is the result of context. These reflections seemed to call for the development of a conceptual framework to analyse factors that contribute to the achievement of such learning objectives, such

as a Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP-) model. This generic model, originally developed by Stufflebeam (1969), ironically for the field of programme evaluation, categorises independent variables (factors) into three categories in order to explain a dependent variable (product) taking into account the interaction of the involved factors.

While there was, in effect, consensus – or at least no dissent – among respondents on the issue that peace education should be assessed, and not (only) evaluated, in the sense of these words as used here, at this stage of the study, this opened up the question of what learning outcomes were those sought in peace education. In this analysis, two things could be noticed fairly quickly: first that, just like the discussion on learning outcomes confirmed the primacy of the learner (subject) over the object (peace), which emanated from the discussion on peace education, it also confirmed the notion that had come up in the discussion on peace, that learning outcomes should be relational. That is to say they should reflect issues of identity and diversity. Secondly, that the sheer diversity of types or levels of learning objectives (knowledge, skills, attitudes, dispositions, competencies, etc.) suggested that one type or category of learning outcomes would not be sufficient to describe learning objectives of peace education. This was of course even more understandable given that the experts chose to maintain the conception of peace education as an umbrella term, as discussed in the previous section.

To begin illustrating the first of these two points, several respondents emphasised the importance of some kind of involvement with diversity, with ‘Others’, e.g. (US-based academic with a focus on conflict resolution P1): “In terms of longer term outcomes and sustainability, I’d look for a student’s organically (... self motivated) continued engagement with including diverse ‘Others’ and involvement in related activities”. This position was echoed by several other respondents, for example (US-based academic with a focus on human rights education P4):

There may be core outcomes of peace education related to skills that are promoted through the teaching and learning processes, including: knowledge specific to the context in which peace education is taking place; analytical skills; and attitudes and skills that support positive relationships with others and acceptance of differences.

And, even more explicitly, in relation to groups, P10 (the Qatar-based, British former UN-official) clarified that:

When we did the peace education program with UNHCR, some people said, including Anna Obura, that the big issues are between groups, and therefore if you train individual students, you'll not solve any problems between groups.

This relationality of peace, in terms of a learning outcome-like phrasing, was captured with one word by P3: empathy. This was intelligible from the perspective that this suggests a tacit realisation of One-ness: empathy may be interpreted as the understanding of the Other from an awareness that, somehow, *one is the other*. In P3's words, interpreted, the capacity of empathy establishes the link with the Other in a cognitive way as well as affectively: cognitively, in that it enables the subject to see issues from the point of view of someone else; and affectively in the sense that this perception moves the subject in one way or another, that is to say, involves him or her emotionally. This empathy can occur between others as individuals but, more importantly, it can also be directed at Other-ness, i.e. towards others as a group.

The issue of Other-ness brings us back to one that was twice addressed earlier on in this analysis, albeit briefly: in Section 6.2, in relation to the question of whether non-human others should be considered objects of peace in peace education; and in Section 6.3, in relation to Dewey's notion that education for human beings is fundamentally different from training animals. Does empathy cross the line of our species? While I would think Agamben (2003) put it too harshly when he argued that the humanisation of animals coincides with the animalisation of human beings (p. 86), in Section 6.2, we understood peace-as-process as group equality. While we can maintain that human groups are fundamentally equal, we cannot say this about non-humans; in fact, animalisation of other human groups has at times functioned as a tool for justifying mistreatment of others – such as, for example, during colonisation – while, conversely, education has been understood specifically as “humanisation” (Gill & Niens, 2014, p. 10). Therefore, in this context, we would not include non-human subjects or, more specifically, subjects with no *Vernunft* in the sense of Kant (1996, p. 143), as counterparts for peace.

This brings me to the second point of those mentioned above: that (levels and types of) learning outcomes that were mentioned were varied. For example, US-based academic and former administrator P13 argued that peace education “outcomes are rooted in specific knowledge, skills, capacities and attitudes”. More broadly still, according to Korean chief researcher P7 “the main desired learning outcomes should cover both cognitive and non-cognitive aspects, including socio-emotional and behavioural domains of learning, particularly such as critical thinking skills, holistic understanding of the situation (of the lack of peace), basics of human rights, empathy, solidarity, multiple identities, sensitivity and respect for diversity, non-violent conflict resolution skills, and so on.” Notwithstanding the reference to some domains of learning, in the response, overall, not much was said about taxonomies applicable to peace education, although both the cognitive and affective domain were mentioned (P12), much less that one specific domain could or should cover all of peace education. The idea of a ‘theory of change’ linking domains of learning also came up, implicitly, in the idea that knowledge might somehow be linked to values and values to behaviour.

Learning objectives that were specifically mentioned by the respondents touched upon some of the aspects of relationality, discussed previously. Israeli academic and activist P5, for example, discussed the relation to oneself in the context of learning objectives and, specifically, the recognition of one self in relation to others. In her words:

So, I think one objective that I have is that people are going to feel strong and capable to promote peace. I think one of the main issues, challenges that we’re facing is that especially women, but also men in peace education don’t feel they’re capable in implementing their ideas. ... They [believe] that they’re not good enough, they’re not smart enough, they’re not professional enough to develop an educational material and [so] it’s done by some other expert. And usually the people who are developing materials are people who are less educated, less qualified, but have more self-esteem or more institutional support to develop these things. So the first and most important for me is to enable people to implement their thoughts and feelings and aims into concrete materials.

Another type of learning outcome that was mentioned, and that would seem to follow from a basic recognition of identity and diversity, is that of knowledge about these identities and differences and the conflicts they can give rise to. For example, one respondent (US-based

academic with a focus on conflict resolution P1) mentioned: “being able to describe what a peaceable community would look like, articulate some causes of violence and name means accessible to the student of interrupting that violence (dialogue, community problem solving workshops, advocacy).” It is interesting that this tended to be mentioned in the context of a scale that, in line with Bloom’s taxonomy, which itself asserts the difference between lower and higher order thinking skills in the cognitive domain, seemed to suggest that knowledge precedes advanced skills (in this case: knowledge, analysis, application). Another example is that, according to US-based academic with a focus on human rights education P4, the outcomes of peace education include, presumably in this order: “knowledge specific to the context in which peace education is taking place; analytical skills; and attitudes and skills that support positive relationships with others and acceptance of differences.”

This last point is complex. The respondent referred to ‘attitudes and skills that support positive relationships with others’. What could these be? Before addressing this question directly, it is incumbent to observe that, in such responses, there seemed to be references to skills, knowledge, attitudes and so on, without necessarily extensive conceptualisation. Here, the different domains of learning outcomes, such as the cognitive and the affective one, briefly referred to above, could help us establish some order by categorising the mentioned outcomes. In the case of P4, it seemed that lower order skills, such as ‘knowledge’, precede higher order skills, such as analysis. However, in the case of P1, quoted earlier on, it seemed that knowledge (cognitive realm) was followed by outcomes from a different realm, namely the affective one, arguing that: “In terms of longer term outcomes and sustainability, I’d look for a student’s organically (ie, self motivated) continued engagement with including diverse ‘Others’ and involvement in related activities” [same quote as above].

Although these conceptions seemed slightly unclear to me at first sight, I slowly saw a tentative hierarchy in learning outcomes emerge from the various responses. Referring to the concept of relationality, mentioned above, and applying this as an organising principle, I saw, in line with Heidegger’s (1927/2006) philosophy as outlined in *Being and Time*, that *Sorge* (care, or concern) was a starting point for understanding learning outcomes as discussed. What is needed to engage with identity and difference is some type of engagement-based care. I call this: recognition. This

is a first pre-requisite and, in sequential terms, a first stage where difference is recognised⁸⁴ (and which refers, first, to one's own identity and, secondly, to diversity, i.e. others' identities). This diversity may occur on a number of axes such as ethnicity; sex or gender; religion; etc. In terms of learning outcomes, one taxonomy applicable here is Krathwohl et al.'s (1964) affective domain, who elaborated this on the basis of the concept of 'responsiveness'. This concept expresses Heidegger's *Sorge* in denoting engagement. This stage can, to a large extent, be said to coincide with the relation one has to one's self.

Once some basic recognition of identity and diversity, through *Sorge*, responsiveness or engagement with this would have occurred, knowledge of these identities and diversities that are recognised, can be generated. This would follow P1's order where "being able to describe what a peaceable community would look like", or recognition, would be followed by the (cognitive) skill to "articulate some causes of violence". This largely coincides with what Allport (1979) called an 'informational approach' to reducing prejudice between groups (p. 485). It represents a stage where information is gathered on difference, that is to say, firstly, one's own identity and, secondly, the other's, leading to diversity. This could involve several educational subjects or disciplines, including history (addressing issues such as migrations, war, colonisation and in general the narrative of events that lead to group formation), geography (borders and border conflicts, geographical distribution of cultures), religious studies, cultural anthropology and the social and human sciences in general. In terms of taxonomy of learning outcomes, here, Bloom et al.'s Book I would apply.

As knowledge may be necessary, but not sufficient learning in peace education, as the various responses testify, in line with P1, after gathering knowledge, one would expect "continued engagement with including diverse 'Others'" be it in terms of gender, culture or other identifiers. This area has been theorised by Allport, in his chapter on contact in *The Nature of Prejudice*, referenced earlier. On this third stage, learning would be experiential, involving an excursion (social travel) or similar type of educational event as proposed by Allport or the intercultural and interreligious encounter as described by Gill (2016b, p. 490). Incidentally, this order of stages,

⁸⁴ Like the word realisation, used above, the word recognition is ambiguous: similarly to acknowledgment it means at once factual acknowledgement, which is cognitive, and appreciation, which belongs to the affective realm.

where the stage of knowledge precedes that of contact, was validated by Allport. According to Allport (1979), for contact to lead to more positive or, one could argue, more realistic impressions of (group) others, i.e. reduction of prejudice, some level of prior education is a prerequisite (pp. 264-265). Without this, moments of contact may in fact consolidate rather than diminish existing prejudice. Interestingly, support for Allport's initial hypothesis comes from empirical research on internationalisation of higher education, where a more drawn out contact (study abroad) led to acquisition of an intercultural identity (Gill, 2007).

P4's view, quoted above that, in terms of learning objectives, peace education should flow into "attitudes and skills that support positive relationships with others and acceptance of differences" suggested that there should exist a learning objective above 'mere' contact. We saw that she referred to both 'attitudes' and 'skills'. Similarly, US-based academic with a focus on philosophy of education P2 argued that: "Outcomes should focus on the development of capacities—capacities of critical thinking, inquiry, reflection, etc. as well as the development of a sense of justice." These views suggested that, following on from a recognition of self and others, identity and diversity; a stage of gathering knowledge about these (different) identities; and one of engagement with these diversities; a stage should follow that returned to an affective set of objectives where the relations that were recognised, explored and ultimately engaged with, would become 'right relations', that is to say, relations of fundamental equality. This seemed, in this phase of the analysis, to be addressed, to an extent, by Kohlberg's stage of moral development called principles of individual conscience.

What knowledge (be it 'know that' or 'know how') do these principles of individual conscience refer to? While Kohlberg argued that moral reasoning is essentially cognitive, he added that it should be accompanied by moral action to effectively be moral. This indicates it is not sufficient to theoretically know what is the right thing to do, that right relations are relations of equality, but that it is necessary to act accordingly or at least have a will (conation) to do so – I say will, because in line with Kant's idea (1996) that morality, rather than moral competence, lies in intention (p. 34) one cannot be blamed for impossibility of action. Thus, in as far as conation exceeds the cognitive realm, what kind of learning might apply here? I assert that the answer to this question is hidden in P4's view, which referred to both attitudes and (cognitive) skills *that*

support positive relationships with others and acceptance of differences. There exists a specific set of skills that unites attitudes and skills supporting positive relations with others: inter-cultural competence or inter-cultural communication skills, roughly as described by Deardorff (2006)⁸⁵ for inter-cultural competence and by Lustig and Koester (2006) for inter-cultural communication skills, and summarised by Perry and Southwell (2011).

This is the ‘know how’ that allows for that what is needed for relational peace: communication between (individuals from) different groups to bridge identity and diversity, self and others. Communication, moreover, is a process; it promotes and expresses understanding at the same time as it is both expressing oneself and listening, which Gill (2016b) calls “a compassionate act” (p. 492) and requires traits such as empathy (p. 456), which themselves reflect principles of individual conscience.

In schematic form, the hierarchy presented in the previous paragraphs, might be thought of as follows:

	Stage	Domain	Learning outcome
↓	Recognition: of identity and difference	Affective	Responsiveness
	Knowledge: of own and other groups	Cognitive	Lower order (memorisation), higher order (analysis)
	Contact: with other groups	Conative	Open-ended [hopefully reduction of prejudice]
	Moral (conscience)	Multiple	Inter-cultural communication

Tab. 5: Taxonomy of learning outcomes in peace education

As in the analyses in Sections 6.2 and 6.3, here again we see convergence and divergence from the conceptual analysis. The principal finding from the discussion on peace education (in Section

⁸⁵ Interestingly, Deardorff’s study was also based on an application of Delphi methodology.

6.3), that the learner is more important than the subject (peace), was confirmed in this section, when peace was identified as the social purpose, not the learning outcome of peace education. In this regard, we saw convergence with the conceptual analysis. The notion that learning outcomes in peace education refer to identity and diversity, on the other hand, was certainly idiosyncratic to the empirical phase of this study.

Again similarly to the conceptual analysis, the outcomes of peace education were not limited to only one domain or taxonomy of learning. Rather, learning objectives pertinent to several domains or taxonomies were mentioned, leading to a tentative proposal for a classification of learning objectives relevant to peace education, culminating in inter-cultural communication skills. Including this in the draft statement of principles allowed for it to be validated, refined or even refuted by the respondents in the following round of the Delphi (Round 2).

This led to Paragraphs 6, 7 and 11, as follows:

6. The outcomes of peace education should thus be human-centred, i.e. they should focus on the development of knowledge, capacities and dispositions, and not on peace itself, although this would be its ultimate objective. Peace is the ‘social purpose’ of peace education, not its learning outcome.

7. Peace education is about peace between groups rather than individuals, and therefore about unity in diversity in relation to group characteristics. This suggest four levels of learning outcomes of peace education:

- a. The recognition of self and difference;
- b. Knowledge of self and others;
- c. Engagement with others, that is to say, contact;
- d. Principles of universal justice (incl. equity).

11. This suggests the importance of culture and, therefore, intercultural communication skills, which can be assessed in a number of ways, including assessment of foreign language skills; critical reading; presentation and debating; and other non-traditional methods.

I will now proceed with the analysis on assessment.

6.5 Round 1: Understandings of assessment in peace education

On the final issue of this analysis, the assessment of learning outcomes, respondents were once again roughly divided in three groups: there was one group that thought that achievement of peace education learning outcomes could or should not be assessed at all, or at least that their assessability was seriously questionable; there was another group that thought it might be difficult but not impossible to assess achievement of peace education learning outcomes, mainly because appropriate methodologies and methods had not yet been developed; and, finally, there was a group that thought that achievement of peace education learning outcomes can be assessed (almost) as any other educational subject.

To start with the first group of those mentioned above, one participant expressed uncertainty as to whether achievement of learning outcomes in peace education should be assessed at all. The English academic P8 argued that: “Yes, they can [be assessed]. But should they? This is I think the deeper question.” This position was, at times, justified by a concern also found in the literature (Amani Williams, 2015; Gill, 2016a), that assessment was, almost by nature, thought of as competitive, thus going against the very spirit of peace education.

Another participant (the Qatar-based, British former UN-official P10), in the same group, argued that achievement of peace education learning outcomes should not be assessed, especially if tied to a result (a grade), albeit for another reason:

I wouldn't actually dream of assessing them, the heart and values of individuals, because I think it's almost a privacy issue. ... The nearest you could get would be, beside observation ... focus group discussions where you set a skilled facilitator who could bring out the pros and cons, the reservations, the realities. In fact, the best way to get them to be honest would be to ask them: 'well, which parts of this course stick in your mind and were most helpful to you?' And through that, you can get some kind of evaluation of what that course has meant to the students. But if you tie it to an individual exam result, you won't see very honest answers. And so I don't see the point of that.

While this first group consisted of only two respondents, the second group, which considered that assessment of peace education might be difficult but not impossible, consisted of only one (the Colombian academic P3). According to this respondent:

In this regard, we are still at a point that I would consider very crude. I believe that many of the things that we call 'competencies' we do not know very well how to assess, and I have the hope that with technological advances we will be able to assess at some point in the future what is difficult to assess now with paper and pen-based tests.

In line with this argument, another participant (Israeli academic and activist P5) elegantly argued that discussion on assessment could itself be a topic of peace education.

The third group, according to which peace education could be assessed, by and large, like any other subject, was by far the largest. The plainest expression of this was that (Nigerian academic P12): "Learning outcomes in peace education can be assessed like any other subject because learning in peace education occurs in [the] same domains as with other subjects." This position coincided with the idea adopted above, that peace education learning outcomes span traditional realms of learning, such as cognitive skills. The Austrian academic P16 added an important nuance to this:

As far as the aim of peace education is a far reaching political and social goal (see question 4), it cannot be assessed like maths, for instance. But this is also true for much other pedagogy. As far as peace ed. uses methodologies that are also used in other educational contexts, it can be assessed like all other subjects or activities.

In general, the majority of this group similarly still thought that there were differences between assessing peace education and other subjects. For example, according to US-based academic with a focus on philosophy of education P2 the achievement of learning objectives in peace education can be assessed "like any other subject, but in more authentic ways." This seemed to relate to an idea on which there was some level of agreement, that assessment in peace education should be holistic, covering not only skill dimensions, but also attitudes and behaviour dimensions (P7). This would have important methodological implications: while skill may be

assessed by traditional tests of performance or competence,⁸⁶ attitude cannot simply be equated to competence. While there exist tests on attitudinal traits – the Big Five⁸⁷ being the most well-known – the constructs behind these differ from competence.

One respondent (P4) oscillated between the third and the first group:

Traditional assessment tools such as essays, projects and portfolios may work fine. Non-traditional assessments such as peer- and self-assessments might also be used. However, *I don't believe that it is possible or advisable to assess all of the learner outcomes that may come about through participation in a PE program.* [Emphasis mine]

In several of these responses, there existed a strong notion that, as learning objectives in peace education might be of more than one type, so there might be more than one type of assessment. Again, this aligned well with the analysis on learning objectives. With great nuance, respondent P13 (the US-based academic and former administrator) argued that choice of type of assessment depended on the selected learning outcomes:

It depends upon how the learning outcomes are defined. Autonomous student outcomes ... (knowledge acquisition and understanding, skill development, attitude assessment/change, capacity development) can be measured using traditional means. Measuring the impact of these learning outcomes upon personal, social, institutional and political change (ie the social purposes) is a more complex challenge. Some things, however, can be measured. For instance, social emotional learning and restorative justice programs (subsets of peace education) in schools have shown dramatic reductions in school-based violence and improvements in student learning in other subject areas.

Particularly interesting in this third group were responses with examples of methods to assess the achievement of learning outcomes in peace education, even though sometimes these were not really methods – for example US-based academic with a focus on international and multicultural education P9 mentioned: “Participatory, longitudinal and student-centered” methods; or (Korean chief researcher P7):

⁸⁶ Wood and Power (1987) argued that the difference is that competence is what someone could do under ideal circumstances, whereas performance is what someone does under actual circumstances (p. 409).

⁸⁷ These are: openness; conscientiousness; agreeableness; extraversion; and neuroticism (John & Srivastava, 1999).

Through personal accounts and reflections by the learners themselves, their teachers and peers, and their parents, particularly on the aspects of values, attitudes, and behaviours – whether or not they are congruent with what they have learnt. But, on certain particular skills, such as critical thinking skills and peaceful conflict resolution skills, some kinds of test or more objective evaluation of performance, like any other subject, are also possible. Yet, the overall assessment should be holistic, covering all dimensions including values, attitudes, behaviours and skills.

Apart from the existence of these three groups, on the issue of assessment, there seemed to be two points of relative agreement: first, that learning outcomes of peace education are first and foremost individual and should therefore be assessed individually (P2, P7, P12). This connected well with the consensus reported on in the previous section, on learning outcomes, stating the same. While there were some participants that argued that learning outcomes can be assessed both individually and collectively, the emphasis was on individuality. Secondly, there seemed to be some level of consensus that peace education assessment should rely on multi-methods assessment (P7) in relation to the specific outcomes that were chosen (P13), e.g. enquiry-based projects (P2) or meta-cognitive self-assessment (P1).

For my purposes, I should connect this discussion with the tentative ‘taxonomy’ proposed in the previous section, with four levels of learning outcomes. In this context, US-based academic and former administrator P13’s view seemed most useful to chart a way forward in understanding how to assess in peace education. Namely, each of the four levels require a different type of assessment. As a reminder, these are: recognition of self and difference; knowledge of self and others; engagement with group others (contact); principles of individual conscience, understood as inter-cultural communication skills.

One could argue that educational assessment is relevant only from the second level onward as recognition (of identity and diversity) can be regarded as a stage of necessary precondition before the next stage (of knowledge) can be accessed. Here, it should be noted that Krathwohl et al. (1964) did develop items for what, in Bloom’s affective domain would be the counterpart for recognition: this would be ‘awareness’ or Level 1.1 (p. 37). They clarify, however, that this is “almost a cognitive behaviour” (p. 99). This is part of the level of ‘receiving’ (1) where “the

learner be sensitized to the existence of certain phenomena and stimuli” (p. 98) – awareness means that “the learner merely be conscious of something” (p. 99). For example, there is a learning objective of ‘consciousness of color, form, arrangement, and design in painting’ (p. 105), which could be understood as consciousness of difference in dress, customs, etc. The proposed item for this consists of the task to select pairs of paintings grouped based on things in common among 40 stimulus pictures, with different paintings. For this, no prior knowledge is necessary. However, if applied to human groups, such groupings might be seen as stigmatising if they become crystallised in an educational assessment test.

At the following stage, of knowledge, no new educational assessment methodology is required, as accepted methodologies already exist. When it comes to cognitive testing as to group identity and diversity, this is relatively straightforward in relation to lower order skills, such as items that ask for national flags of countries, holy books of certain religions or physiological differences of sexual groups. Test items also exist for higher order thinking skills, such as Bloom et al.’s (1984) levels of analysis, synthesis or evaluation. These items can assess critical thinking skills. While synthesis is a bit different in that it requires the independent development of something, Bloom et al. give several examples of items of evaluation where a logical conclusion must be drawn from preceding statements (e.g., p. 196), which can be translated to items related to identity and diversity. A concrete example on analysis of an item pertaining to different socioeconomic – or household income – groups includes a stimulus consisting of a ‘statement of facts’ where average percentages of family members that were given no medical attention during a given year are represented by family income category. The presented data suggest a negative relation between household income and medical attention and proposed the conclusion that members of families with smaller incomes are healthier than those with larger incomes. It then asks which assumption of four must be true for the conclusion to be true.

For the third stage, of contact, Allport (1979) stressed that the “assumption underlying various participation and action programs is that contact and acquaintance make for friendliness [but] we know that this is not always the case” as contact “in a hierarchical social system, or between people who equally lack status ... or contacts between individuals who perceive one another as threats, are harmful rather than helpful” (p. 488). While a reduction of prejudice would be hoped

for, and possibly even expected, after passing through the previous stage and with an effective organisation of the contact activity (Allport cited a 1952 study by Trager and Yarrow according to whom the same contact, but with a different focus, leads to different outcomes), the warnings of education not becoming indoctrination (P13) are very important here.

While, in the section on evaluation Allport (1979) proposed a programme evaluation approach for contact activities (he called this ‘action research’, p. 491) it might well be argued that there exists no alternative to this. To work around this, Table 5 above signalled that, at this stage, the learning outcomes are open-ended. This does not need to mean that no assessment takes place, but it does suggest that this would be a good place to practice the notion of not grading as suggested by some participants (see below). I suggest that the contact experience be assessed by a dialogic debriefing or, otherwise, a group discussion to jointly evaluate the experience.

The fourth stage of peace education, and its learning outcomes, may be considered the point where assessment of learning outcomes in peace education reaches its zenith. As discussed in the previous section, this should be assessed in terms of inter-cultural communication skills. This means that Kohlberg’s (1981) moral dilemmas should *not* be used here. But what tests and items might be used? Inter-cultural communication is generally seen as a discipline that seeks the optimum between effective and appropriate communication (Arasaratnam, 2009). As Sercu (2004) argued for such skills in foreign language education, attempts “have been made to design a framework for the assessment of intercultural competence” and while many “of the assessment techniques proposed are actually also teaching techniques—cultural minidramas, critical incidents, culture assimilators, simulation games and documents originating from a foreign culture”, still, “it is clear that a systematic framework for the operationalization of assessment of intercultural competence in foreign language education remains to be developed” (p. 74). Incidentally, the case for teachers of English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) to become involved with peace education was forcefully made by Kruger (2012); and in the context of university internationalisation, Gill (2010) mentioned the potential of (foreign) language as a tool for reconstruction of identity, referring to how Gadamer suggested learning a second language provides an opportunity to experience otherness as “in all our knowledge of ourselves and in all

knowledge of the world, we are always already encompassed by the language which is our own’’ (Gadamer 1977, p. 62 cited in Gill 2016b, p. 495).

Indeed, very few instruments seem to exist to assess inter-cultural communication skills. Among these few is a test based on Ruben’s (1976) Intercultural Behavioural Assessment Indices, implemented by Chen (1992). This consists of an observation tool to assess seven behavioural elements “that make individuals function effectively in intercultural settings” (p. 64), which include: displays of respect; interaction posture; orientation to knowledge; empathy; role behaviours; interaction management; and tolerance of ambiguity (Ruben, 1976, pp. 339-352). Matveev and Yamazaki Merz (2014) reviewed 10 instruments to assess intercultural competence, which included only one to assess intercultural communication skills, developed by Arasaratnam (2009): the Intercultural Communication Competence Inventory (ICCI). Arasaratnam and Doerfel (2005) had earlier identified empathy, motivation, attitude toward other cultures, and interaction involvement (for example, listening) as important elements of intercultural communication competence (ICC). However, the ICCI instrument does not test communication skills. It includes 10 items, such as: ‘I feel more comfortable with people from my own culture than with people from other cultures’, referring rather to the construct behind the multicultural personality questionnaire (MPQ), which it is incidentally based on. In addition, this instrument cannot be considered an educational assessment tool, as it does not assess any skill. It assesses personality traits. More work should therefore be done in developing assessment frameworks and items for intercultural communication skills.

Finally, as US-based academic with a focus on international and multicultural education P9 argued, peace education “requires transforming content, pedagogy, structures, educational practices, relationships between educators and learners, and the systems by which we measure the outcomes of education as well”. In their final reflections, other respondents similarly argued that peace education presents an opportunity to re-think educational assessment overall and, in particular, the convention of grading. Of this practice, P1 questions the appropriateness, while P5 even likens this to collaborating with a “patriarchal sexist approach”. US-based academic and former administrator P13 considers: “Traditional marking seeks to compare students to peers”, which may not be most relevant for peace education as this “requires inquiry into the

autonomous learner's development.” If the problematique behind this study is based on the desire to develop peace education in educational terms, then it is relevant to highlight the educational use of assessment in peace education. The purpose of this should be to provide a view of the achievement of the learners, itself thought to reflect their abilities to conduct tasks under different circumstances; or to obtain a view of deficiencies in certain sub-domains for remedial education purposes. It should not be put to the use of creating what Ball (2001), based on Lyotard, would call a “system of ‘terror’ ... that employs judgements, comparisons and displays as a means of control, attrition and change” (p. xxxvii).

Thus, in line with the conceptual analysis the type of assessment to be applied in peace education is completely dependent on the trait that is subject to assessment. Building on the proposal of learning outcomes for peace education as presented in the previous section, and in line with the positions of the respondents, different types of assessment are proposed for each of these levels. In as far as peace education can be assessed like any other subject, psychometric tools can be applied. While the individual nature of assessment is emphasised, the significance of context must be considered. Therefore, in line with the analysis in Section 6.4, the CIPP model is considered as a useful analytical device. Finally, assessment-based competition is considered potentially harmful to the wider objectives of peace education.

This analysis led to Paragraphs 8 through 10 and 12, 13 and 15 as follows:

8. These levels of learning outcomes suggest different types of learning assessment. While educational assessment may become relevant only from the second level onward, no new educational assessment methodology would need to be developed for the second level as this level of learning outcomes is essentially cognitive.

9. The third level can be assessed by verifying whether the contact has taken place, without judgements on this. However, this should be accompanied by a debriefing in the form of a dialogue, or group discussion to evaluate the experience. The focus of this should be on discussing the experience as such, without any ‘right or wrong’.

10. The fourth level may be considered the point where assessment of learning outcomes in peace education reaches its apotheosis. It should be noted that this does not simply coincide with (assessment of)

moral education, but with human centred outcomes (see § 6) in relation to universal justice on the group level (see § 4, 7).

12. Just like peace education, its assessment is process in addition to outcome, too. As the extent to which one succeeds, in peace education, is the extent to which others benefit, assessment in peace education should not be competitive. Assessment is an integral part of peace education and its methods should be ethical.

13. Psychometrics can be used in assessment in peace education, just like in other subjects. It is recommendable to develop a context, input, process and product (CIPP-) model for assessment in peace education, given the importance of context and collective in relation to the individual and their achievement in this subject.

15. Just like peace education has the potential to transform education, so thinking about assessment in peace education has the potential to transform thinking about assessment in general.

I will now proceed to describe the changes to the statement of principles following the implementation of Round 2.

6.6 Round 2: Refinements

In Round 2, responses from 9 out of 16 participants were received (see full register of comments in Annex VII). While some comments simply expressed agreement, others were more formal, in the sense of referring to form rather than to substance, and again others led to changes of varying degrees of importance, in the statement. Only very few I did not agree with and the register explains why this was so, on a case-by-case basis. Usually, this was from the point of view of the coherence of the emerging theory; for example, the emerging theory indicated that peace education was, in fact, constituted by addressing identities, both self and difference, and these differences are usually group differences rather than individual ones. As a consequence, some types of education that would usually be grouped under this heading, such as education for sustainable development, were not anymore. Where one respondent indicated that they should be, I explained in the register why they were not.

It should be said that none of the comments altered the structure or essence of Version 1 of the statement significantly. However, some changes to the structure were made in that certain paragraphs were moved, for added clarity, and almost all paragraphs were, to some extent, reworded. One important comment that did lead to a more or less significant change pertained to the definition of positive peace. At this stage, the statement referred to concepts such as ‘justice’ and ‘universal justice’, and one participant requested this to be clarified. In positive definitions of peace, justice was referred to by four participants as key manifestations of this. However, the concept of justice is surprisingly underrepresented in the literature on positive peace – although, significantly, Galtung said that absence of structural violence includes justice, and equality, and argued that justice is, in essence, equality, as discussed in Section 6.2.

I developed this further in an earlier paragraph with reference to Kant because universal justice was connected to principles of individual conscience, as per Kohlberg (1981), who referred to Kant (p. 7). Thus I clarified that positive peace “embodies the Kantian ideas that (a) every human being, as a subject of Reason, is an end in itself and (b) that one should act in such a way that one’s action could be a universal law”, which ideas are themselves underpinned by the idea of “human beings’ fundamental equivalence” in two elements: firstly, a criterion of demarcation (Reason, *Vernunft*) vis-à-vis other entities (for example, animals); secondly, a definition of peace that is not a state, but can be practically applied: the Golden Rule, included in the way that it was formulated by Kant (1996), that morality is submission to a universal law and is manifested in the maxim ‘act so that your behaviour can be the basis for a universal law’ (pp. 51, 140). This foundational idea I then used to establish a relation with the central idea behind peace education, i.e. the “relation between self and others, or identities” arguing that as:

... the greatest threat to human equivalence is the idea that one (group) identity is of greater worth than another, in peace education peace is, primarily, inter-group peace. It pursues the ideal of unity - in essence and value - in diversity of appearance.

A second major point emanating from Round 2 referred to the four levels of engagement mentioned in the old Paragraph 7, and now moved to Paragraph 10. One participant had emphasised the importance of multiple and overlapping identities, which I applied to these levels of engagement. In fact, the notion that identity – and diversity – is central to peace education had

not yet been formulated explicitly in Version 1 of the statement, and I did so during this revision. While Level 1 stayed relatively similar, as a level referring to recognition of identities; as did Level 2 as a level of knowledge of identities; and 3 one of contact, or engagement, with other identities, Level 4 changed significantly, mainly as a response to Comment 23 in the register (P10) as it was modified from “[p]rinciples of universal justice (incl. equity)” [this should originally have said ‘equality’ instead of ‘equity’] to:

Identification with principles of universal justice (as per § 4 and 5 above), and as reflected in the UDHR, that is to say, on the assumption that communication is key to identity and identification, and that identity and Otherness are essentially cultural, the acquisition of intercultural communication skills.

Thus, as can be seen here, the contention that this learning outcome should be measured in terms of the presence of intercultural communication skills was now moved from a separate paragraph to the paragraph describing the learning outcome itself, for added clarity. While there exists a separate literature on the subject of inter-cultural communications skills (see Section 6.4), this literature is itself relatively inconclusive on the key issue of how such skills should be assessed. And while the development of concrete items will be a task for follow-on research and development work, in this context, I would propose that the following could be examples of (or bases for) items:

Ex. 1: A dialogue between two persons from different groups, in which they cannot see one another. At the end, both indicate the extent to which they felt ‘understood’ by the other.

Ex. 2: Critical reading: texts from the media are given to learners. Assessment is on the extent to which learners manage to ‘criticise’ these texts, including the identification of fallacies.

Ex. 3: Languages as recognition: the extent to which learners can speak other languages than their own.

Ex. 4: Replication of a legal case: students each represent a different group in respect of a specific case and there is a ‘judge’ that evaluates their arguments. For example, a male and a female learner, representing the other sex, discussing the issue of equal pay. Or an Israeli and a Palestinian learner on the ‘right of return’.

As a consequence of the analysis following Round 2, some changes were made to the statement, leading to the final version of this, which is included as Annex VIII. While the first two introductory paragraphs of the first draft version were maintained, they were moved down, as an additional introductory paragraph was included to demarcate the territory covered by the statement, as follows:

1. This statement formulates principles for the assessment of learning outcomes in peace education.

Both former Paragraphs 3 and 4 were maintained, in essence (albeit renumbered to Paragraphs 4 and 5), however, in line with the abovementioned, § 4 was modified to include a reference to Kant and § 5 used to amplify the importance of identity, thereby clarifying the notion that peace education was mainly about group differences.

The issue of peace education was now covered in Paragraphs 6 through 8, where the former § 5 was moved to § 6, and slightly modified, to emphasise the idea that education is, like peace, not only or even mainly an end state, but a process. An additional paragraph, § 7, was inserted to distinguish peace education from other types of peace engagement, such as peace studies, and the new § 8 was inserted as the slightly modified, previous § 14, which maintains the idea that peace education is an umbrella term, albeit with the indicated lines of demarcation. This modification was suggested by a participant (P16) with a view to grouping all statements on peace education together.

Statements 9 through 11 now covered the issue of learning outcomes, and while 9 and 10 were the reformulated Paragraphs 6 and 7, respectively, § 11 covered the issue of inner peace, as had been requested by several participants in Round 2. Finally, in the final version of the statement, Paragraphs 12 through 15 covered assessment; § 12 was essentially a regrouping of the previous Paragraphs 8, 9 and 10, and § 13, 14 and 15 were the old § 12, 13 and 15. It is important to note that the old § 11 was fused with the old § 7.d to form the new § 10.d.

6.7 Round 3: Towards expert consensus

For the third round of Delphi, all 16 participants were asked whether they agreed, *grosso modo*, with the statement; agreed with qualifications; or did not agree. Responses were received from nine participants and, of these, eight agreed ‘*grosso modo*’ with the statement of principles and one agreed ‘with reservations’. No participant(s) indicated that they did not agree. *This suggests that the statement reflects, to a reasonable extent, expert consensus on how to assess learning in peace education.*

The one participant that agreed with reservations (option b) included the followed reservations:

3. The domain that these principles cover consists of four main concepts: peace; education (for peace); learning outcomes (of peace education); and assessment (of the learning outcomes of peace education), which relate to each other in the given sequential order. To describe how the achievement of learning outcomes in peace education can be assessed, these concepts are clarified below.

P16: In my view, there is one main concept: peace education, which includes and combines for sub-concepts. The general purpose of peace education is to enable the learners to struggle and to work for peace.

I would agree with this, but believe this is rather a question of formulation than substantive disagreement.

5. Peace is thus a type of relation between self and others, or identities. As the greatest threat to human equivalence is the idea that one (group) identity is of greater worth than another, in peace education peace is, primarily, inter-group peace. It pursues the ideal of unity - in essence and value - in diversity of appearance.

P16: The greatest threat, as I see it, is not an idea, but the practice (including ideas, culture, structure) of domination over other human being. For this purpose, the idea that one group (identity) is more worth than another, is very functional.

Unity in diversity is fine, but the core issue is conflict – nonviolent conflict resolution. This is the essence of inter-group peace.

I would argue that the practice of domination of one group over others stems from an idea that it is of greater worth than the other group. There was no expert consensus on conflict as the central concept of peace education.

7. While there exists learning without teaching, education without learning is unthinkable. Peace education initiatives, therefore, by definition include learner engagement.

P16: Relatively poor, compared to the other points

While I can certainly understand why respondent P16 made this point, I included it for reasons outlined in Section 6.6, above. The central point here is the demarcation between peace education and other activities related to peace (for example, non-violent conflict resolution, peace-keeping, peace studies research).

8. Thus, while peace education may operate as an umbrella term, its criteria of demarcation are that it denotes (a) learner engagement (b) in relation to identity - self and other(s) – focusing, primarily, on inter-group peace. Groups can be defined in a number of ways, including gender, national and religious. Thus peace education includes international education, religious education and sex education. Global citizenship education (GCED) may be considered archetypal peace education.

P16: As mentioned in my comment on point 3, the idea of peace ed. is enabling the learners to work for peace, which means a) personal peacefulness and b) struggle against non-peaceful practices, cultures, structures.

While I would agree that these would be things that peace education could strive for, I see a few challenges: firstly, how do we conceive of personal peacefulness? The analysis above addresses this, by saying that issues underlying peacefulness relate to identity and difference. It thus goes a step further than the assertion that personal peacefulness will enable learners to work for peace. If peacefulness means, in one way or another, non-engagement, then this would interestingly go against the regulating principle that Krathwohl et al. (1964) defined for the affective domain, i.e. responsiveness (see Section 5.4).

9. As peace education focuses on identity, and on the human mind's engagement with this, its learning outcomes should be human-centred, i.e. focus on the learner's development rather than peace itself, although this is its ultimate objective. Peace is the social purpose of peace education, not its learning outcome.

P16: Ok, learner's development. But what does it mean? Conflict resolution capacity, peace-worker capacity, see my other comments.

This is addressed in the following paragraph, § 10.

10. The above suggests four levels of engagement, as per § 7 above, that may in principle take place on any educational level, with associated learning outcomes:
 - a. The *recognition* of self and difference, that is to say, of identity and identities, which are likely to be multiple, overlapping and possibly conflicting;
 - b. *Knowledge* of self and others, that is to say, knowledge of these identities (gender, national, religious and socio-economic);
 - c. *Engagement* with others, that is to say, contact with carriers of other identities, either physical or otherwise;
 - d. *Identification* with principles of universal justice (as per § 4 and 5 above), and as reflected in the UDHR, that is to say, on the assumption that communication is key to identity and identification, and that identity and Otherness are essentially cultural, the acquisition of intercultural communication skills.

P16: Where is the central place of conflict?

On the basis of the Delphi-derived data, reflecting some extent of expert consensus, I do not agree that there is a central place for conflict in peace education. If there were, we would be likely working from a negative definition of peace. The central place is reserved for identity and difference, based on the analyses as outlined above.

13. As an integral part of peace education, its assessment should be ethical. As the extent to which one succeeds in peace education is the extent to which others benefit, assessment in peace education should treat competition with caution.

P16: ... should be ethical? Of course. But why not put it like this: should be guided by the same ethical principles as peace ed. itself?

One might argue that the proposed improvement is implied by the clause ‘as an integral part of peace education’, but in as far as it is not, this change would probably be an improvement.

14. Psychometrics can be used in assessment in peace education. It is recommendable to develop a *context, input, process and product* (CIPP-) model for assessment in peace education, given the importance of context and collective in relation to the individual and their achievement in this subject.

P16: Ok, but why is only psychometrics highlighted? Why no word about combining quantitative and qualitative research methods? Why not mention action research?

The reason for this is, that the gap that this study addresses is the lack of assessment in favour of evaluation. Assessment is, to a large extent, underpinned by psychometrics (the measurement of manifestations of the mind), in its several variations, described, for example, in Handbook IV of Educational Measurement of the American Council on Education (Brennan, 2006). It includes qualitative and quantitative methods, but mentioning them outside the context of psychometrics suggests that I favour continuing with the prevalence of the evaluation paradigm in peace education over an educational assessment one (see Sections 1.1 and 3.6) and this is patently not the case. Action research is not mentioned because it is a research modality that might include assessment, but the focus of this study is specifically on assessment.

Thus, I concluded the analysis of the Delphi underpinning this study. As some level of expert consensus was achieved, I assumed that the analysis correctly reflects the positions of the experts participating in the study.

7. Discussion and conclusion

7.1 Re-iteration of the problematique

In concluding this study, before proceeding to answer the research question, I will first re-iterate its underpinning problematique and then briefly reflect on both the potential contributions and limitations of this study. As discussed in Chapter 1 (Introduction), and in Chapter 3 (Literature review), since around the beginning of this century there exists a perception that evaluation in peace education is weak (see Section 1.2). However, on closer examination, I found that, rather than non-existent, in as far as it does occur, evaluation in peace education often does not include educational assessment data, especially in the context of non-formal education initiatives. While one could argue that this is the weakness of peace education evaluation referred to, there does seem to exist little awareness in the debate on this subject. Rather, considerations pertaining to educational assessment seem to be absent from the debate on evaluation in peace education as, when assessment is mentioned, this usually does not refer to educational assessment but is considered synonymous to evaluation (e.g., Barbeito Thonon & Ospina, 2015; Kester, 2013).

As a consequence of this, while evaluations of peace educations do occur (albeit, according to several members of the research community, not sufficiently frequently), assessments often do not in non-formal education. This, in turn, means that there exist data on the extent to which non-formal peace education programmes achieve programme objectives, but little on what learners have learnt (assessments in formal peace education, on the other hand, are hardly reported on in the academic literature). I hypothesised that this fact might not be coincidental: after all, the complaints about the difficulties of evaluating peace education often go hand-in-hand with complaints that it, as a subject, is largely undefined (see Sections 1.1 and 3.1). There exists no unified curriculum for peace education or widely agreed learning objectives and, without learning objectives, it is difficult possible to assess achievement in peace education, as the assessor does not know what to look for if she or he would like to use a generic approach. What is still possible, however, is to measure whether a programme has led to peace, especially if understood as negative peace (absence of violence). Thus, programme evaluation is possible. To

be clear, evaluation and assessment are not mutually exclusive entities: evaluation, of a programme, is largely defined by design (pre-test post-test); assessment, on the other hand, is largely defined by method (multiple choice test, driving test, essay, interview, etc.).

This preliminary analysis led me to consider that, to answer the main research question, I would first need to examine what the learning outcomes for peace education are or could be. Of course, I also needed to consider how such a normative question as the research question for this thesis could be answered. Clearly, it could not be answered objectively; the normative dimension of the question stipulated an element of subjectivity. This led me to an interpretive approach. However, given the specialised nature of the subject, I could not just gather subjective perceptions from anyone. Rather, what was required to map this domain, in which theory is scarce, was to source expert opinion. Yet, having experts agree on a subject is notoriously difficult, while I was looking for consensus. This seemed especially complex as the research question unites two paradigms that are usually seen as quite distinct (assessment and peace education), as discussed in Chapter 2. My search for a research design that would help me elicit expert consensus led to me to consensus methodologies and, specifically Delphi, as explained in Chapter 4. I applied this methodology over three rounds of data collection, via questionnaires or interviews, culminating in a brief position document that would reflect the consensus on the research question: the ‘statement of principles’ (Annex VIII). The fact that Delphi provides for several rounds of feedback served as a safeguard against incorrect interpretations of the emerging consensus.

The fact that the research question straddles two paradigms involved the need for some groundwork that could subsequently help organise the phase of empirical data collection or, with more precision: the structure of the questionnaire. Each of its constituent concepts might be seen as contested: peace, education, learning outcomes and assessment (see Sections 1.1 and 1.4). Therefore, I preceded the collection of data with a phase of conceptual analysis as described in Chapter 5. I organised this in a cascading manner, that is to say, following an analysis of the concept of peace, I proceeded to analyse the concept of education, but as conditioned by the previous analysis; that is to say, this analysis focused on the relation between education and peace and, ultimately, education for peace, or peace education. Subsequently, I analysed the concept of learning outcomes, again with relevance to peace education; and, finally, the concept

of assessment but with a view to understanding assessment of the learning outcomes of peace education. This last analysis proved inconclusive, emphasising the relevance of an empirical inquiry to answer the research question. This was realised through the application of the Delphi as presented in the previous chapter, Chapter 6 (Data analysis).

7.2 Discussion and reflections

While I believe that this study has contributed some insights on the interface of educational assessment and peace education, there were, certainly, some limitations. In the previous section and in other places in this thesis, I have alluded to the fact that the research question straddles two paradigms, implying an almost inevitable tension: while peace educators may tend to believe that peace education seeks a culture of cooperation, they may also tend to believe that assessment implies a culture of competition. They may ask: how is it possible to assess such things as peace education seeks? Are we not debasing peace by trying to assess it? Are we not subverting peace education into war education by another name, if we assess achievement of learning outcomes in peace education? Almost as a mirror image of this academic culture, while assessment specialists may tend to be interested in developing protocols and specifications, they may also believe that peace education professionals prefer maintaining at least a margin of ambiguity, even rejoice in an extent of non-measurability. In the course of this study, such pre-conceptions of these cultures or groups were confirmed rather than disconfirmed.

These differences implied both a potential of this study and a possible limitation: on the side of its limitations, the process of the study would not be sufficient to overcome the existence of these different perspectives (I will address this further, in the paragraph below). Yet, I hope that publication of this study may help bring the communities closer to one another. On the side of potential, one lay in helping some individual participants overcome some preconceptions they might have had, in the course of exchanges in person, via Skype or by e-mail. For example, educational assessment does not need to mean ranking, competition or commodification. In addition, as addressed in Chapter 2, the later stages of this study occurred against the background of a new international development target for education, SDG 4.7, on peace and similar types of

education and even a specific indicator (4.7.4) on learning in peace education. This indicated an appreciation of the potential of peace education within the international development community that did not exist previously and, consequently, an opportunity for wider uptake or mainstreaming of peace education. So then, this study became an opportunity for the peace education community to present a united front on what it stands for, and explore whether a generic approach to assessment, as per 4.7.4, is possible.

The potential contributions and limitations of this study also have to be addressed in light of the chosen methodology: Delphi. As suggested above, one of the questions implicit in this investigation was whether parts of two existing communities of practice – educational assessment and peace education – could form a new community focusing on the assessment of learning in peace education. Specific characteristics of the Delphi that could, from one point of view, be considered to be amongst its advantages (the physical distance, the anonymity clause) turned out to be limitations in terms of creating this new community of practice. For example, it meant that it was not possible for study participants to enter in a direct discussion with one another. Such discussion might have led to a possibility to arrive at shared understandings more directly than via Delphi.⁸⁸ On the positive side, the Delphi did provide an excellent framework for analysing views in detail, because of their written form. For example, I prepared a relatively detailed register of how I dealt with feedback on the first version of the statement of principles, and so could make my analysis transparent to participants, before asking them to indicate agreement with the final statement. So while the study might have led to some consensus, it did not help to create a community of practice.

Another important potential contribution of this study lay in the exploration of the possibility of, or even the development of the groundwork of learning objectives for peace education. I always felt that learning objectives have an almost intrinsically positive, egalitarian and almost democratic connotation: instead of understanding achievement (mainly) as a result of someone's 'intelligence' or 'intrinsic aptitude', it provides an understanding of milestones that can be achieved through a process of learning by, in principle, anyone. A skill is then not something one

⁸⁸ Surely, a clear additional limitation imposed by the methodology lay in that the participants were inevitably limited in number and that their recruitment was subject to researcher bias. As I discussed how I tried to avoid this in Section 4.3, this is not discussed again in this section.

can do because one is born with it, but can be learnt. In considering what the learning objectives or outcomes for peace education could or should be, lies a clear challenge for the community of peace education: understanding the essence of the field; understanding in which domains learning objectives lie and, in line with this, whether these domains differ from other education subjects; and, finally, understanding the challenge of assessing these objectives. This potential contribution suggested that, through this exploration, a greater understanding of peace education by its practitioners could be obtained.

7.3 Conclusion: The principles for assessing peace education

While the previous chapter followed the sequence of the three rounds of Delphi that were applied and, nested within these, that of the conceptual analysis, in this section I will start at the end, thus first providing an answer to the research question, and then work backwards towards its roots in the data pertaining to the first-mentioned concepts in the question. That is to say, I will first address the issue of assessment and learning outcomes and then discuss how this is rooted in analyses of education and peace. As to the answer to the research question, ‘how should the achievement of learning outcomes in peace education be assessed?’, this is as follows:

achievement of learning outcomes in peace education should be assessed in a range of different ways, in relation to the type of learning outcome that is subject to assessment. This is formally included in Paragraph 8 of the statement of principles:

8. These levels of learning outcomes suggest different types of learning assessment. [...]

However, what are these different ways, and to which learning outcomes do they relate? These outcomes are the ones mentioned in Table 5, Section 6.4: in a first stage, recognition of identity and difference, as described, for example, in Krathwohl et al.’s (1964) affective domain. While the learning outcome is responsiveness, here, no assessment is considered necessary as this stage is considered a pre-requisite for following stages. Secondly, knowledge of own and other groups. This refers to the cognitive domain, for which methods of assessment already exist. Learning outcomes follow the pattern of Bloom’s taxonomy, including higher and lower order thinking

skills. Thirdly, contact with other groups. This refers to the affective domain again and, in this case, the learning outcome is open-ended (note: although a reduction of prejudice is hoped for, this is not a learning outcome as it is problematic to state that this should occur). This means that assessment can consist of a debriefing, and take place without a need for marking or grading. Incidentally, this study found that assessment in peace education should help re-think non-peace oriented practices in assessment in general, such as grading.

Finally, peace education is said to culminate on a moral stage, which draws on multiple domains of learning. After careful consideration of the data and, in the course of analysis, finding myself in a position of having “to develop ideas on a level of generality higher in conceptual abstraction than the qualitative material being analysed” that is to say, having to “use more abstract concepts to account for differences in the data” (Glaser & Strauss, 2009, p. 114), I elevated the view of one participant to the status of criterion to achieve this: that the culmination of learning in peace education consists of skills “that support positive relationships with others and acceptance of differences.” I found there to exist one set of skills, in particular, that supports positive relations with others: inter-cultural communication skills. Such skills both allow for a prerequisite to the realisation of peace, on the understanding that communication helps individuals from different groups to bridge identity and diversity and, in the same time, it is a process, which itself requires non-cognitive traits such as empathy (Gill, 2016b, p. 456), which are often considered to reflect aspects of morality.

Assessment of inter-cultural communication skills, however, can be considered to find itself only at a basic level of development. Instruments to assess such skills are extremely rare, and one of the few instruments that I could identify, Arasaratnam’s (2009) Intercultural Communication Competence Inventory (ICCI), cannot be said to measure communication *skills*. Its items rather seem to assess disposition (Section 6.5). Incidentally, lest the above conclusion were considered speculative (which, to an extent, it originally was), I should mention that the feedback rounds of Delphi provided safeguards against speculation that is not grounded in consensus. Feedback was received on the first, draft version of the statement of principles, and this was used to develop its final version. As mentioned at the end of Section 6.7, for the third round of Delphi this final statement was sent to all 16 original participants, to ask whether they agreed, grosso modo; with

qualifications; or did not agree with the statement. The fact that eight responses of nine received indicated agreement, *grosso modo*, and the one remaining indicated agreement with reservations suggests the statement reflects, reasonably, expert consensus.

This was captured in Paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 of the statement of principles:

8. [...] While educational assessment may become relevant only from the second level onward, no new educational assessment methodology would need to be developed for the second level as this level of learning outcomes is essentially cognitive.

9. The third level can be assessed by verifying whether the contact has taken place, without judgements on this. However, this should be accompanied by a debriefing in the form of a dialogue, or group discussion to evaluate the experience. The focus of this should be on discussing the experience as such, without any 'right or wrong'.

10. The fourth level may be considered the point where assessment of learning outcomes in peace education reaches its apotheosis. It should be noted that this does not simply coincide with (assessment of) moral education, but with human centred outcomes (see § 6) in relation to universal justice on the group level (see § 4, 7).

Further to the above, the analysis validated the original problematique, indicating that peace is the social purpose, not a learning outcome of peace education. This justified the search for learning outcomes, even more so as peace education was found to necessarily be learner-focused, in contrast to peace studies, which is focused on peace. This conception of peace education was rooted in a concept of peace that starts with the 'carriers of peace', in the here and now, rather than in an inert utopia, separate from the learners at the end of time (see Section 6.2). Separately, the study confirmed the perception of peace education as an umbrella concept, albeit it with one decisive characteristic: that its object be identity and diversity (this definition helped develop learning outcomes) of human groups. This notion itself was rooted in another aspect of peace: that it is relational; it is something that exists vis-à-vis counterparts and is constituted by right relations with these counterparts. These, in turn, were understood to be relations of equality. This helped clarify that, for example, sexuality education (education on sexual or gender groups) is

peace education, but education for sustainable development is not. Global citizenship education emerged as an archetypical manifestation of peace education.

To keep the respondents, which are all recognised experts in the field of the study (peace education and, where possible, peace education evaluation), engaged, it was necessary to present the consensus in a manageable format. For this reason, it had been communicated at the outset of the study that the statement would be relatively short, i.e. 1-2 pages. As a consequence, and to be able to cover the topic at the appropriate level of abstraction, it turned out to be necessary to be ‘strategic’ in the choice of principles and efficient in how they were to be formulated. This meant among other things that, in the statement, there are no concrete examples of items for assessment in peace education. In the analysis, in Section 6.6 specifically, I gave a few examples that might form blueprints for future items, but only for illustrative purposes. However, as the analysis found that the learning outcomes of peace education exist on several levels or at least in several categories, and that they include traditional levels or even non-traditional levels for which both assessment frameworks and items have already been developed, I believe that this shortcoming is not that important.

Finally, while no participant indicated disagreement with the statement, this should not be interpreted as that it is beyond improvement. In a communication after the implementation of the data collection, one participant indicated that, while they agreed with it, they would still recommend some editing before sharing with external parties, such as United Nations agencies.

7.4 Recommendations for further research

Now, what does all of this mean? I believe that there are four main consequences for academic debate and research that should be drawn, based on the conclusion as presented in the previous section. First among these is the fact that this study validated the relevance of the problematique underpinning the study and the original research question. There existed – and in fact there continues to exist – a real discrepancy between the focus of peace education evaluation and the purported focus of peace education itself. While peace education evaluation looked at whether

programmes achieved peace, one participant's differentiation between the learning objectives and social purpose (peace) of peace education was extremely helpful. Indeed, the study found strong support for the conception that peace education is responsible for educating learners for peace before being responsible for peace itself (in line with, e.g., Harris, 2003). This suggests, for the research community, that it should engage to a greater extent with educational assessment in peace education. The statement, which proposes a number of conceptual clarifications along with a set of learning outcomes will hopefully go some way towards making a generic approach to educational assessment, beyond programme evaluation, possible in peace education.

Secondly, and further to the issue of what exactly has to be assessed in peace education, this study proposes a model of four stages: recognition; knowledge; contact; and a moral stage. Further research should be undertaken to (in-) validate the model. In addition, it is not clear whether these are sequential stages, that is to say, whether one should necessarily follow up on the other and, if so, whether they are related to specific age groups or educational levels. For example, while the notion that contact without knowledge can reinforce existing prejudices has been documented in the literature (Allport, 1979, pp. 264-265), it seems problematic to argue that contact between individuals belonging to different groups (for example, gender groups) should not occur until a certain amount of knowledge is in place. Gill (2016b) offered an interesting account of how a group of students from different countries first enjoyed each other's diversity; then entered into a phase of tension due to a problematic incident; and finally overcame this by discussing the incident, its implications and each other's backgrounds and identities. In summary, the proposed model requires further study and development.

Thirdly, while the nature of inter-cultural communication skills, in which the learning outcomes of peace education culminate, is addressed elsewhere (e.g., Perry & Southwell, 2011), it was found that there exist very few instruments that are designed to assess these skills (to note: I currently discuss such skills except for foreign language skills, which are understood to be part of the concept of inter-cultural communication skills, and for which methods of assessment do exist). One of the few instruments I found, Arasaratnam's ICC), cannot be considered to measure inter-cultural communication skills. This suggests an urgent need for the development of assessment instruments (that is to say, tests) that measure inter-cultural communication skills for

assessment in peace education to be possible. The development of such a tool should address the development and study of the behaviour of specific items, in psychometrical terms including item response theory (IRT), which can study item properties⁸⁹ in a range of different contexts and cultures. Additional research might address the development of a CIPP model (Stufflebeam, 1969), which, in conjunction with research instruments for collecting data on factors associated with different levels of achievement, levels of variability of achievement and levels of concentrations of achievement, may support the interpretation of assessment findings.

Finally: one of the surprising findings of this study was that several education subjects that were considered peace education, such as human rights education or environmental education (Hung, 2007, p. 40) are not peace education as per the Delphi's expert consensus. The focus on (group-) identity and difference seems idiosyncratic to this study. For example, while Salomon (2009) did emphasise the importance of peace between groups in the context of peace education, he did not underline that of identity and difference. Yet, while surprising, it is convenient. As could be seen at various points in the course of this study, there existed a significant conceptual lack of clarity in peace education as to its definition, which hindered the development of assessment theory and practice. Peace education seems to return to its origins: as discussed, there was a strong relation between peace education as it is now known, and international and global education as alluded in UNESCO's 1974 'Recommendation Concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education Relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms' and Becker's and Anderson's advocacy work. It seems that the international agenda may once more be at the heart of education generally and peace education, specifically.

In the hope that these efforts will somehow find their use, I submit this work.

⁸⁹ Item difficulty, discrimination, DIF and other parameters.

References

- Abdullahi, S.A. (2010). Rethinking global education in the twenty-first century. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Global pedagogies. Globalisation, comparative education and policy research* (23-34). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Abu-Nimer, M. (2001). Conflict resolution, culture, and religion: Toward a training model of interreligious peacebuilding. *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 38, Nr. 6, 685–704.
- Abu-Nimer, M. & Smith, R.K. (2016). Interreligious and intercultural education for dialogue, peace and social cohesion. *International Review of Education*, Vol. 62, 393–405.
- Agamben, G. (2003). *Das Offene: Der Mensch und das Tier* [The open: Human being and animal]. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Ager, A., Boothby, N. & Wessells, M. (2007). The use of consensus methodology in determining key research and practice: Development questions in the field of intervention with children associated with fighting forces. *Intervention: International Journal of Mental Health, Psychosocial Work and Counselling in Areas of Armed Conflict*, Vol. 5, Nr. 2, 124-129.
- Akgun, S. & Araz, A. (2014). The effects of conflict resolution education on conflict resolution skills, social competence, and aggression in Turkish elementary school students. *Journal of Peace Education*, Vol. 11, Nr. 1, 30-45.
- Allport, G.W. (1979). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books. (Originally published 1954)
- Althof, W. & Berkowitz, M.W. (2006). Moral education and character education: Their relationship and roles in citizenship education. *Journal of Moral Education*, Vol. 35, Nr. 4, 495-518.

Amani Williams, H.M. (2015). Peaceableness as raison d'être, process and evaluation. In C. Del Felice, A. Karako & A. Wisler (Eds.), *Peace education evaluation: Learning from experience and exploring prospects* (3-18). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Ananiadou, K. & Claro, M. (2009). *21st Century skills and competences for New Millennium Learners in OECD Countries*. OECD Education Working Papers, Nr. 41. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Andrews, P. [and 83 others] (2014, May 6). OECD and Pisa tests are damaging education worldwide – academics. *The Guardian*. Retrieved 14 January 2017 from: <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2014/may/06/oecd-pisa-tests-damaging-education-academics>

Annan, K. (2000). *Secretary-General stresses immediate need for new and effective measures for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation*. Press release SG/SM/7292 DC/2676. New York: United Nations. Retrieved 24 September 2017 from: <http://www.un.org/press/en/2000/20000202.sgsm7292.doc.html>

Annan, K. (2013). *Interventions*. New York: Penguin.

Arasaratnam, L. A. (2009). The development of a new instrument of intercultural communication competence. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, Vol. 20, 2-21.

Arasaratnam, L. A. & Doerfel, M. L. (2005). Intercultural communication competence: Identifying key components from multicultural perspectives. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 29, 137-163.

Ashton, C.V. (2007). Using theory of change to enhance Peace Education evaluation. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, Vol. 25, Nr. 1, 39-53.

Augustinus, A. (2007). *De stad van God* [The city of God]. Amsterdam: Ambo. (Originally 5th century CE)

Baesler, E.J. & Lauricella, S. (2014). Teach peace: Assessing instruction of the nonviolent communication and peace course. *Journal of Peace Education*, Vol. 11, Nr. 1, 46-63.

Baird, J. A., Isaacs, T., Johnson, S., Stobart, G., Yu, G., Sprague, T. & Daugherty, R. (2011). *Policy effects of PISA*. Oxford: Oxford University Centre for Educational Assessment.

Bajaj, M. (2008). Introduction. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education* (1-11). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Ball, S. (2001). Global policies and vernacular policies in education. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, Vol. 1, Nr. 2, xxvii-xliii.

Bar-Tal, D. (2009). The elusive nature of peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world* (27-36). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Bar-Tal, D. and Adwan, S. (2013). *Victims of our own narratives?* Council of Religious Institutions of the Holy Land. Retrieved 12 February 2017 from:
https://d7hj1xx5r7f3h.cloudfront.net/Israeli-Palestinian_School_Book_Study_Report-English.pdf

Barnett, J. (2008). Peace and development: Towards a new synthesis. *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 45, Nr. 1, 75–89.

Barbeito Thonon, C. and Ospina, J. (2015). Assessing peace education at the national level: Challenges and possibilities. In C. Del Felice, A. Karako & A. Wisler (Eds.), *Peace education evaluation: Learning from experience and exploring prospects* (239-253). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Berlak, H. (1992a). Toward the development of a new science of educational testing and assessment. In H. Berlak, F.M. Newmann, E. Adams, D.A. Archbald, T. Burgess, J. Raven & T.A. Romberg (Eds.), *Toward a new science of educational testing & assessment* (1-21). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Berlak, H. (1992b). The need for a new science of assessment. In H. Berlak, F.M. Newmann, E. Adams, D.A. Archbald, T. Burgess, J. Raven & T.A. Romberg (Eds.), *Toward a new science of educational testing & assessment* (181-206). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Bilagher, M. (2004). The implications of structuralism for the assessment of student learning. *UNRWA Student/Teacher Journal*, Nrs. 1 and 2, June and December, 4-11.

Bilagher, M. (2005). What is qualitative research? *UNRWA Student/Teacher Journal*, Nrs. 1 and 2, June and December, 8-13.

Bilagher, M. (2010). Education: Academic discipline or field of study? *Research Intelligence*, Iss. 110, 22-23.

Bilagher, M. (2015a). El caso del TERCE: El uso de los resultados de evaluaciones de aprendizaje para la mejora de la enseñanza [The case of TERCE: On the use of educational assessment findings to improve teaching]. In M. Poggi (Ed.), *Mejorar los aprendizajes en la educación obligatoria: políticas y actores*. Buenos Aires: Instituto Internacional de Planeamiento de la Educación IIPE-Unesco.

Bilagher, M. (2015b). *Medición de aprendizaje en habilidades no-cognitivas: MIL y LLECE* [Measurement of learning in non-cognitive skills: MIL and LLECE]. Presentation at Regional Orientation and Capacity Building Workshop on Global Citizenship Education for Latin America and the Caribbean Region, 1-3 September 2015, Santiago, Chile. Retrieved 12 February 2017 from: <http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/FIELD/Santiago/pdf/Moritz-Bilagher-medicion-aprendizajes-habilidades-no-cog.pdf>

Bilagher, M., Holz, M. & Iturria, J. (2014). *Learning goals and the global agenda*. PREAL Blog. Retrieved 11 February 2017 from: <http://www.thedialogue.org/blogs/2014/03/international-development-and-the-global-indicator-of-learning/>

Binkley, M., Erstad, O., Herman, J., Raizen, S., Ripley, M., Miller-Ricci, M., & Rumble, M. (2012). Defining twenty-first century skills. In P. Griffin, E. Care & B. McGaw (Eds.), *Assessment and Teaching of 21st Century Skills* (17-66). Dordrecht: Springer.

Black, P.J. (1998). *Testing: friend or foe? The theory and practice of assessment and testing*. London: Falmer Press.

Bloom, B. S., Hastings, J. T. & Madaus, G. F. (1971). *Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of student learning*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Bloom, B.S. [and 33 others] (1984). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Book 1 cognitive domain*. New York, NY: Longman. (Originally published 1956)

Bobbitt, J. (1918). *The curriculum*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Boulding, E. (2000). *Cultures of peace: The hidden side of history*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Braslavsky, C. (undated). *The curriculum*. Retrieved 10 September 2017 from: <http://www.unhas.ac.id/hasbi/LKPP/Hasbi-KBK-SOFTSKILL-UNISTAFF-SCL/Hasbi-UNISTAFF-DOCUMENT/MODUL%20UNISTAFF%20SURABAYA%202006/QTL/curriculum%20development/cecilia%20e.pdf>

Brennan, R.L. (2006). Perspectives on the evolution and future of educational measurement. In R.L. Brennan (Ed), *Educational measurement*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

British Educational Research Association (2011). *Ethical guidelines for educational research*. London: BERA.

Broadfoot, P. (1979). *Assessment, schools and society*. London: Methuen.

Cabinet Office (1999a). *Modernising government*. Cm 4310. London: The Stationery Office.

Cabinet Office (1999b). *Professional policy making for the twenty-first century: A report by the Strategic Policy Making Team*. London: Cabinet Office.

Carment, D., James, P. & Taydas, Z. (2009). The internationalization of ethnic conflict: State, society, and synthesis. *International Studies Review*, Vol. 11, Nr. 1, 63–86.

Chen, G.M. (1992). A test of intercultural communication competence. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, Vol. 2, 63-82.

Cherryholmes, C. (1989). *Power and criticisms: Poststructural investigations in education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Christie, D.J. (1991). *The measurement of psychological constructs in peace education*. Paper presented at the 98th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, August 10-14.

Chung, B.G. and Park, I. (2016). A review of the differences between ESD and GCED in SDGs: Focusing on the concepts of Global Citizenship Education. *Journal of International Cooperation in Education*, Vol. 18, Nr. 2, 17-35.

Cisco, Intel and Microsoft (2010). *Assessment and teaching of 21st century skills*. Status Report. Retrieved 9 January 2017 from: http://www.cisco.com/c/dam/en_us/about/citizenship/socio-economic/docs/ATC21S_Exec_Summary.pdf

Coleman, J.S., Campbell, E.Q., Hobson, C.F., McPartland, J., Mood, A.M., Weinfeld, F.D. & York R.L. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

COPAFS (1993). *Providing incentives to survey respondents*. Retrieved 30 April 2017 from: http://www.copafs.org/reports/providing_incentives_to_survey_respondents.aspx#summary

Coughlan, S. (2013). *How Pisa became the world's most important exam*. BBC.com. Retrieved 14 January 2017 from: <http://www.bbc.com/news/business-24988343>

Cronbach, L.J. (1960). *Essentials of psychological testing*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Cuhls, K. (undated). *Delphi method*. Retrieved 21 September 2014 from: http://www.unido.org/fileadmin/import/16959_DelphiMethod.pdf

Dalkey, N. & Helmer, O. (1963). An experimental application of the Delphi Method to use of experts. *Management Science*, Vol. 9, 458–467.

Danesh, H.B. (2008). The Education for Peace integrative curriculum: Concepts, contents and efficacy. *Journal of Peace Education*, Vol. 5, Nr. 2, 157-173.

Danesh, H.B. (2015). *Education for Peace* in Bosnia and Herzegovina: How do we know it is working? In C. Del Felice, A. Karako and A. Wisler (Eds.), *Peace education evaluation: Learning from experience and exploring prospects* (145-161). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Davis, A. (1995). Criterion-referenced assessment and the development of knowledge and understanding. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, Vol. 29, Nr. 1, 3-21.

Davis, A. (1999). Educational assessment: A critique of current policy. *Impact*, Vol. 1999, Iss. 1, 1-49.

Davis, A. (2015). Assessment and accountability. In Gerard Lum (Ed.), *Educational assessment on trial*. London: Bloomsbury.

Davydov, V.V. [translation by Kerr, S.T.] (1995). The influence of L.S. Vygotsky on education theory, research and practice. *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 24, Nr. 3, 12–21.

Deardorff, D.K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, Vol. 10, Nr. 3, 241–266.

Deem, R. (1998). ‘New Managerialism’ and Higher Education: The management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, Vol. 8, Nr. 1, 47-70.

Del Felice, C., Karako, A. & Wisler, A. (2015). Introduction. In C. Del Felice, A. Karako & A. Wisler (Eds.), *Peace education evaluation: Learning from experience and exploring prospects* (xv-xxii). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Descartes, R. (2008). *A discourse on method*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Originally published 1637)

Dewey, J. (2011). *Democracy and education*. Mansfield Centre, CT: Martino Publishing. (Originally published 1936)

Diaz, C., Massialas, B.G., & Xanthopoulos, G. (1999). *Global perspectives for educators*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Duckworth, C. (2008). Maria Montessori and peace education. In Monisha Baja (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of peace education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Duckworth, C.L., Allen, B. & Triguba Williams, T. (2012). What do students learn when we teach peace? A qualitative assessment of a theater peace program, *Journal of Peace Education*, Vol. 9, Nr. 1, 81-99.

Education Scotland (2017). *Benchmarks: Religious and moral education*. Retrieved 25 September 2017 from:
<https://education.gov.scot/improvement/Documents/RMEBenchmarksPDF.pdf>

Enslin, P. (2009). South Africa: The Truth and Reconciliation Commission as a model of peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo. *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world* (237-243). New York, NY: Psychology Press. (Originally published 2002)

Falkenstein, L.C. (1983). *Global Education: State of the art*. Research Summary Report. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Lab.

Fink, A., Kosecoff, J., Chassin, M. & Brook, R.H. (1991). *Consensus methods: Characteristics and guidelines for use*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Fisher-Smith, J. (1993). Field observations: An interview with Wendell Berry. *Orion*, Autumn, 50-59.

Fountain, S. (1999). *Peace Education in UNICEF*. New York, NY: UNICEF, Education Section, Programme Division.

Fox, J. (2004). The rise of religious nationalism and conflict: Ethnic conflict and revolutionary wars, 1945–2001. *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 41, Nr. 6, 715–731.

Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man*. London: Penguin.

Gadamer, H.-G. (1977). *Philosophical hermeneutics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Galtung, J. (1967). *Theories of peace: A synthetic approach to peace thinking*. Oslo: International Peace Research Institute.

Galtung, J. (1975). *Peace: Research, education, action – Essays in peace research, I*. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers.

Gardner, H. (2011). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Geisinger, K. (2016). 21st Century Skills: What are they and how do we assess them? *Applied Measurement in Education*, Vol. 29, Nr. 4, 245-249.

Gill, S. (2007). Overseas students' intercultural adaptation as intercultural learning: A transformative framework. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, Vol. 37, Nr. 2, 167–183.

Gill, S. (2010). The homecoming: an investigation into the effect that studying overseas had on Chinese postgraduates' life and work on their return to China. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, Vol. 40, Nr. 3, 359-376.

Gill, S. (2016a). Why are exams so damaging? *HuffPost UK*. Retrieved 9 July 2017 from: http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/scherto-gill/why-are-exams-so-damaging_b_8067652.html

Gill, S. (2016b). Universities as spaces for engaging the other: A pedagogy of encounter for intercultural and interreligious education. *International Review of Education*, Vol. 62, 483–500.

Gill, S. and Niens, U. (2014). Education as humanisation: A theoretical review on the role of dialogic pedagogy in peacebuilding education. *Journal of Comparative and International Education*, Vol. 44, Nr. 1, 10-31.

Gipps, C.V. (1994/2003). *Beyond testing: Towards a theory of educational assessment*. London: The Falmer Press.

Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (2009). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Transaction. (Originally published 1967)

Gleeson, D. & Knights, D. (2006). Challenging dualism: Public professionalism in 'troubled' times. *Sociology*, Vol. 40, Nr. 2, 277-295.

Goldberg, T. & Ron, Y. (2014). 'Look, each side says something different': The impact of competing history teaching approaches on Jewish and Arab adolescents' discussions of the Jewish–Arab conflict. *Journal of Peace Education*, Vol. 11, Nr. 1, 1-29.

Grant, L. & Matemba, Y.H. (2013). Problems of assessment in religious and moral education: The Scottish case. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, Vol. 34, Nr. 1, 1-13.

Gray, J. (1996). The use of assessment to compare institutions. In H. Goldstein and T. Lewis (Eds.), *Assessment: Problems, developments and statistical issues*. Chichester: John Wiley.

Gur-Ze'ev, I. (forthcoming). Philosophy of peace education in a post-metaphysical era. In I. Gur Ze'ev (Ed.). *Diasporic Philosophy and Counter-Education*.

Hambleton, R.K., Zenisky, A.L. & James Popham, W. (2016). Criterion-referenced testing: Advances over 40 years. In C.S. Wells & M. Faulkner-Bond (Eds.), *Educational measurement: From foundations to future* (23-37). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Hanushek, E.A. & Woessmann, L. (2010). *The high cost of low educational performance: The long-run economic impact of improving PISA outcomes*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Harber, C. & Sakade, N. (2009). Schooling for violence and peace: how does peace education differ from 'normal' schooling? *Journal of Peace Education*, Vol. 6, Nr. 2, 171—187.

Harris, I. (2003). *Peace education evaluation*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 21-25.

Harris, I.M. (2008a). History of peace education. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education* (15-23). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Harris, I.M. (2008b). The promises and pitfalls of peace education evaluation. In J. Lin, E. Brantmeier & C. Bruhn (Eds.), *Transforming education for peace* (245-264). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Harris, I.M. & Morrison, M.L. (2013). *Peace education*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company.

Hattie, J. (2003). *Teachers make a difference: What is the research evidence?* Paper presented at the Australian Council for Educational Research Annual Conference on Building Teacher Quality, Melbourne.

Heckman, J.J. & Kautz, T.D. (2012). *Hard evidence on soft skills*. Working Paper 18121. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Heidegger, M. (2006). *Sein und Zeit* [Being and time]. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. (Originally published 1927)

Horkheimer, M. (1930). *Anfänge der bürgerlichen Geschichtsphilosophie* [Principles of civic history of philosophy]. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Hsu, C.C. & Sandford, B.A. (2007). The Delphi technique: Making sense of consensus *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*. Vol. 12, Nr. 10, 1–8.

Hung, R. (2007). Is ecological sustainability consonant or dissonant with human rights? Identifying theoretical issues in peace education, *Journal of Peace Education*, Vol. 4, Nr. 1, 39–55.

Huntington, S.P. (1993). The clash of civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72, Nr. 3, 22 - 49.

Jerryson, M. & Juergensmeyer, M. (2010). *Buddhist warfare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

John, O. P. & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L.A. Pervin & O.P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (102-138). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Kane, M.T. (2006). Validation. In R.L. Brennan (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (17-64). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Kant, I. (1996). *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft. Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*. [Critique of practical reason. Groundwork of the metaphysic of morals]. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp. (Originally published 1788)

Kant, I. (2008). *Zum ewigen Frieden* [Perpetual peace]. Stuttgart: Reclam. (Originally published 1795)

Kelly, R. (2007). Memory and Reconciliation in Post-Conflict Societies. *ISPI Quaderni di Relazioni Internazionali* [Memoria e conflitti], Nr. 4, 66-79.

Kelly, R. & Fetherston, B. (2008). Productive contradictions: Dissonance, resistance and change in an experiment with cooperative learning. *Journal of Peace Education*, Vol. 5, Nr. 1, 97-111.

Kelly, R. & Kelly, U. (2013). An education in homecoming: Peace education as the pursuit of 'appropriate knowledge', *Journal of Peace Education*, Vol. 10, Nr. 3, 283-302.

Kester, K. (2013). Peace education: An impact assessment of a case study of UNESCO-APCEIU and the University for Peace. *Journal of Peace Education*, Vol. 10, Nr. 2, 157-171.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The meaning and measurement of moral development*. Volume XIII. Heinz Werner lecture series. Worcester, MA: Clarke University Press.

Krathwohl, D.R., Bloom, B.S. & Masia, B.B. (1964). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Book 2 affective domain*. New York, NY: Longman.

Kruger, F. (2012). The role of TESOL in educating for peace. *Journal of Peace Education*, Vol. 9, Nr. 1, 17-30.

Kyriakides, L. & Charalambous, C.Y. (2014). Educational effectiveness research and international comparative studies: Looking back and looking forward. In R. Strietholt, W. Bos, J.-E. Gustafsson & M. Rosén (Eds.), *Educational policy evaluation through international comparative assessments* (34-49). Münster: Waxmann.

Latham, N.I. & Vogt, W.P. (2007). Do professional development schools reduce teacher attrition? Evidence from a longitudinal study of 1,000 graduates. *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 58, Nr. 2, 153–167.

Lazarus, N. (2015). Evaluating seeds of peace: Assessing long-term impact in volatile contexts. In C. Del Felice, A. Karako & A. Wisler. *Peace education evaluation: Learning from experience and exploring prospects* (3-18). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Lazlo, E. (1974). *A strategy for the future*. New York: Brazillier.

Leming, J.S. (1992). The influence of contemporary issues curricula on school-aged youth. *Review of Research in Education*, Vol. 18, 111-161.

Levin, H.M. (2011). The utility and need for incorporating noncognitive skills into large-scale educational assessments. In M. Von Davier, E. Gonzalez, I. Kirsch & K. Yamamoto (Eds.), *The role of international large scale assessments: Perspectives from technology, economy, and educational research* (67-86). Dordrecht: Springer.

Lewis, J.M., O'Flynn, J. and Sullivan, H. (2014). Accountability: To whom, in relation to what, and why? *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 73, Nr. 4, 401–407.

Lewis, W. (1948). *America and cosmic man*. London: Nicholson and Watson.

Linstone, H.A. & Turoff, M. (1975). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Loevinger, J. (1957). Objective tests as instruments of psychological theory. *Psychological Reports*, Vol. 3, 635-694.

Love, R. (2006). Religion, ideology & conflict in Africa. *Review of African Political Economy*, Vol. 33, Nr. 10, 619–635.

Ludwig, B. G. (1994). *Internationalizing extension: An exploration of the characteristics evident in a state university extension system that achieves internationalization*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation at the Ohio State University, Columbus.

Lum, G. (2009). *Vocational and professional capability: An epistemological and ontological study of occupational expertise*. London: Continuum.

Lum, G. (2012). Two concepts of assessment. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, Vol. 46, 589–602.

Lustig, M.W. & Koester, J. (2006). *Intercultural competence: Interpersonal communication across cultures*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Machiavelli, N. (1998). *De heerser*. Amsterdam: Atheneum–Polak & Van Gennep. (Originally published 1532)

Malhotra, D. & Liyanage, S. (2005). Long-term effects of peace workshops in protracted conflicts. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 49, Nr. 6, 908-924.

Mandry, A. (2015). Evaluating a project-based peace education course in Turkey: The civic involvements projects. In C. Del Felice, A. Karako & A. Wisler (Eds.), *Peace education evaluation: Learning from experience and exploring prospects* (103-115). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Manuel, F.E. & Manuel, F.P. (1979). *Utopian thought in the Western world*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press.

Maoz, I. (2009). Conceptual mapping and evaluation of peace education programs: The case of education for coexistence through intergroup encounters between Jews and Arabs in Israel. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo. *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world* (259-269). New York, NY: Psychology Press. (Originally published 2002)

Markman, A.B. (1999). *Knowledge representation*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1988). *Het communistisch manifest* [The communist manifesto]. Amsterdam: Pegasus. (Originally published 1848)

Matveev, A.V. & Yamazaki Merz, M. (2014). *Intercultural competence assessment: What are its key dimensions across assessment tools?* Retrieved 24 June 2017 from:
http://www.iaccp.org/sites/default/files/stellenbosch_pdf/Matveev.pdf

Maudarbux, M.B. (2016). Interreligious education: Conceptualising a needs assessment framework for curriculum design in plural societies (with special reference to Mauritius). *International Review of Education*, Vol. 62, 459–481.

Meadows, D., Meadows, D., Randers, J. & Behrens, W.W. III (1972). *The limits to growth*. New York, NY: Universe.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded source book*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Miller, L. E. (2006). *Determining what could/should be: The Delphi technique and its application*. Paper presented at the meeting of the 2006 annual meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Columbus, Ohio.

Minas, H. & Jorm, A.F. (2010). Where there is no evidence: use of expert consensus methods to fill the evidence gap in low-income countries and cultural minorities. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, Vol. 4, Nr. 33.

Mislevy, R.J. (2006). Cognitive psychology and educational assessment. In R.L. Brennan (Ed.), *Educational measurement*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Montessori, M. (2008). *Education and peace*. Amsterdam: Montessori Pierson.

Montoya, S. & Naidoo, J. (2016). Madrid meeting approves the indicators to monitor progress towards SDG 4 in 2017. *World Education Blog*. Paris: UNESCO GEM Report. Retrieved 24 September 2017 from: <https://gemreportunesco.wordpress.com/2016/11/03/madrid-meeting-approves-the-indicators-to-monitor-progress-towards-sdg-4-in-2017/>

More, T. (2001). *Utopia*. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press. (Originally published 1516)

Mullis, I.V.S. & Martin, M.O. (2007). TIMSS in perspective: Lessons learned from IEA's four decades of international mathematics assessments. In T. Loveless (Ed.), *Lessons learned: What international assessments tell us about math achievement* (9-36). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Mulongo, G. (2014). Debating international learner assessments as a proxy measure of quality of education in the context of EFA: A review essay. *World Journal of Education*, Vol. 4, Nr. 1.

Mumford, L. (1923). *The story of utopias*. London: George and Harrap and Co.

Murillo Torrecilla, J. F. (2007). *Investigación iberoamericana sobre eficacia escolar* [Ibero-American research on school effectiveness]. Bogotá: Convenio Andrés Bello.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education.

Nevo, B. & Brem, I. (2009). Peace education programs and the evaluation of their effectiveness. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world* (271-282). New York, NY: Psychology Press, 271-282. (Originally published 2002)

Newton, P.E. (2007). Clarifying the purposes of educational assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, Vol. 14, Nr. 2, 149-170.

Nusche, D., Laveault, D., MacBeath, J. & Santiago, P. (2012). *OECD Reviews of evaluation and assessment in education: New Zealand 2011*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Obura, A.P. (2002). *Peace Education programme in Dadaab and Kakuma, Kenya: Evaluation summary*. New York: UNHCR.

OECD (2005). *The definition and selection of key competencies: Executive summary*. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved 14 January 2017 from: <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/35070367.pdf>

OECD (2013). *PISA 2012 Assessment and analytical framework: Mathematics, reading, science, problem solving and financial literacy*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD (2014a). *PISA 2012 Results: What students know and can do – Student performance in mathematics, reading and science*. (Volume I, Revised edition). Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD (2014b). *PISA 2012 Technical report*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OREALC/UNESCO Santiago (2008). *Educación de calidad para todos: Un asunto de derechos humanos* [Quality education for all: A topic of human rights]. Santiago de Chile: UNESCO.

Oh, K. H. (1974). *Forecasting through hierarchical Delphi*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation at the Ohio State University, Columbus.

Omomia, O.A. & Omomia, T.A. (2014). Perceived impact of classroom management on effective teaching: A study of five schools in education district 11, Lagos State, Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal*, Vol. 10, Nr. 22, 309-320.

Page, J. (2008). The United Nations and peace education. In Monisha Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Peace Education* (75-83). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Parsons, T. (1959). The school class as a social system. *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 29, 297-318.

Perry, L.B. and Southwell, L. (2011). Developing intercultural understanding and skills: Models and approaches, *Intercultural Education*, Vol. 22, Nr. 6, 453-466.

Plato (1995). *Constitutie. Politeia* [The Republic]. Amsterdam: Athenaeum – Polak and Van Genneep. (Originally 4th century BCE)

Popper, K. (1994). *La lezione di questo secolo* [The lesson of this century]. Venezia: Marsilio.

Popper, K. (2003). *The open society and its enemies*. Vol. 2, Hegel and Marx. London: Routledge. (Originally published 1945)

Popper, K. (2007). *Conjectures and refutations*. London: Routledge. (Originally published 1963)

Postlethwaite, T.N. (1993). Torsten Husén (1916-). *Prospects: the quarterly review of comparative education*, Vol. XXIII, Nr. 3/4, 677-686.

Power, M. (2010). *The audit society: Rituals of verification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Print, M. (1993). *Curriculum development and design*. Saint Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin.

Psacharopoulos, G. (1973). *Returns to education: An international comparison*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Psacharopoulos, G. (1985). Returns to education: A further international update and implications. *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 20, Nr. 4, 583–604.

Psacharopoulos, G. (1994). Returns to investment in education: A global update. *World Development*, Vol. 22, Nr. 9, 1325–1343.

Psacharopoulos, G. & Patrinos, H.A. (2004). Returns to investment in education: A further update. *Education Economics*, Vol. 12, Nr. 2.

Raven, J. (1992). A model of competence, motivation, and behavior, and a paradigm for assessment. In H. Berlak, F.M. Newmann, E. Adams, D.A. Archbald, T. Burgess, J. Raven &

- T.A. Romberg (Eds.), *Toward a new science of educational testing & assessment* (85-116). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Reardon, B. A. (1982). *Militarization, security, and peace education*. Valley Forge, PA: United Ministries in Education.
- Reardon, B. (1988). *Comprehensive peace education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Rescher, N. (1969). *Delphi and values*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Richardson, M. (2016). Educational assessment on trial (2015), by Andrew Davis and Christopher Winch, edited by Gerard Lum. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice* [book review].
- Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rojas, A. (forthcoming). *La UNESCO ante el enfoque de formación por competencias* [UNESCO on the focus on competency-based training].
- Ross, H. & Lou, J. (2008). Pathways to peace: Imag(in)ing the voices of Chinese and American middle school students. In J. Lin & D.C. Bruhn (Eds.), *Educators as peace makers: Transforming education for global peace* (3-21). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Roth, K. (2009). Peace education as cosmopolitan and deliberative democratic pedagogy. In J. Zajda & H. Daun (Eds.), *Global values education: Teaching democracy and peace* (49-63). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Roy Singh, R. (1991). *Education for the twenty-first century: Asia-Pacific perspective*. Bangkok: UNESCO.

Ruben, B.D. (1976). Assessing communication competency for intercultural adaptation. *Group & Organization Studies*, Vol. 1, 334–354.

Salomon, G. & Kuppermintz, H. (2002). *The evaluation of peace education programs: Main considerations and criteria*. Haifa: The Center for Research on Peace Education, University of Haifa.

Salomon, G. (2004). Does peace education make a difference in the context of an intractable conflict? *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, Vol. 10, Nr. 3, 257–274.

Salomon, G. (2009). The nature of peace education: Not all programs are created equal. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo. *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world* (3-13). New York, NY: Psychology Press. (Originally published 2002)

Saunders, L. (2004). *Grounding the democratic imagination: Developing the relationship between research and policy in education*. London: Institute of Education.

Schmeiser, C.B. & Welch, C.J. (2006). Test development. In R.L. Brennan (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (307-353). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Schrum, L. (1991). *Telecommunications: Working to enhance global understanding and peace education*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 3-7.

Schuck, S., Gordon, S. & Buchanan, J. (2008). What are we missing here? Problematising wisdoms on teaching quality and professionalism in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, Vol. 13, Nr. 5, 537-547.

Schulz, M. & Renn, O. (2009). *Das Gruppendelphi: Konzept und Fragebogenkonstruktion* [The group-based Delphi: Concept and questionnaire development]. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D. & Losito, B. (2010). *Initial findings from the IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B. and Agrusti, G. (2016). *IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2016 assessment framework*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Scriven, M. (1967). The methodology of evaluation. In R.W. Tyler, R.M. Gagné & M. Scriven (Eds.), *Perspectives of curriculum evaluation* (39-83). Vol. 1. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech acts*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Sercu, L. (2004). Assessing intercultural competence: A framework for systematic test development in foreign language education and beyond. *Intercultural Education*, Vol. 15, Nr. 1, 73-89.

Seul, J. (1999). “Ours is the way of God”: Religion, identity, and intergroup conflict. *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 36, Nr. 5, 553–569.

Stanley, J. & Williamson, T. (2001). Knowing how. *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 98, Nr. 8, 411-444.

Stenhouse, L. (1976). *An introduction to curriculum research and development*. London: Heinemann.

Stufflebeam, D.L. (1969). Evaluation as enlightenment for decision-making. In A. Walcott (Ed.), *Improving educational assessment and an inventory of measures of affective behavior* (41-73). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

The Earth Charter Initiative (2000). *The Earth Charter*. Retrieved 19 March 2017 from:
http://earthcharter.org/invent/images/uploads/echarter_english.pdf

Torney, J.V., Oppenheim, A.N. & Farnen, R.F. (1975). *Civic Education in ten countries: An empirical study*. New York, NY: Halstead Press of John Wiley.

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H. & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Torney-Purta, J. (1982). *Research and evaluation in global education: The state of the art and priorities*. Paper presented at the National Conference on Professional Priorities: Shaping the Future of Global Education. Easton, Maryland.

Torney-Purta, J. (1989). *A research agenda for the study of Global / International Education in the United States*. Paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th), San Francisco, March 27-31, 1989.

Torney-Purta, J. and Amadeo, J.-A. (2013). The contributions of international large-scale studies in civic education and engagement. In M. Von Davier, E. Gonzalez, I. Kirsch & K. Yamamoto (Eds.), *The role of international large scale assessments: Perspectives from technology, economy, and educational research* (87-114). Dordrecht: Springer.

Toulmin, S. (1992). *Cosmopolis: The hidden agenda of modernity*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago press.

Trager, H.G. & Yarrow, M.R. (1952). *They learn what they live*. New York, NY: Harper.

Trinder, M., Wertheim, E.H., Freeman, E., Sanson, A., Richardson, S. & Hunt, S. (2010). Comparison of the effectiveness of two forms of the Enhancing Relationships in School

Communities project for promoting cooperative conflict resolution education in Australian primary schools. *Journal of Peace Education*, Vol. 7, Nr. 1, 85-105.

UN (1999). *Declaration on a culture of peace*. United Nations General Assembly resolution 53/243 A. Retrieved 25 September 2017 from: <http://www.un-documents.net/a53r243a.htm>

UNESCO (1945). *Constitution*. Retrieved 20 September 2015 from:
http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=15244andURL_DO=DO_TOPICandURL_SECTION=201.html

UNESCO (1974). *Recommendation concerning education for international understanding, co-operation and peace and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms*. Adopted by the General Conference at its eighteenth session, 19 November 1974. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2006). *Thesaurus*. Retrieved 25 September 2017 from:
<http://vocabularies.unesco.org/browser/thesaurus/en/page/concept2>

UNESCO (2012). *General education quality analysis/diagnosis framework (GEQAF)*. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved 14 January 2017 from:
http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/ED/pdf/GEQAF-_English.pdf

UNESCO (2016). *Global Education Monitoring Report 2016. Education for people and planet: Creating sustainable futures for all*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

UNESCO (undated). *Teaching and learning for a sustainable future*. Online multimedia teacher education programme. Retrieved 20 September 2015 from:
http://www.unesco.org/education/tlsf/mods/theme_c/mod18.html

UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2007). *Medium-term strategy 2008–2013*. Montreal: UIS. Retrieved 15 January 2017 from: http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/uis-medium-term-strategy-2008-2013-en_0.pdf

UNESCO Institute for Statistics and CUE (2013). *Learning Metrics Task Force: Recommendations for universal learning*. Retrieved 24 September 2017 from: https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/LMTF-Brochure-FINAL_single-pgs_web.pdf

United Nations Statistics Division (2016). *Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all*. New York: UNSD. Retrieved 24 September 2017 from: <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-4.pdf>

Wagemaker, H. (2013). International large-scale assessments: From research to policy. In L. Rutkowski, M. Von Davier & D. Rutkowski (Eds.), *Handbook of international large-scale assessment: Background, technical issues, and methods of data analysis*. London: CRC Press.

White, R.W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological Review*, Vol. 66, Nr. 5, 297-333.

Winch, C. (2015). The nature and purpose of educational assessment – A response to Andrew Davis. In Gerard Lum (Ed.), *Educational assessment on trial* (57-106). London: Bloomsbury.

Wintersteiner, W. (2015). Towards a more complex evaluation of peace education: Peace education, the evaluation business, and the need for empowering evaluation. In C. Del Felice, A. Karako & A. Wisler (Eds.), *Peace education evaluation: Learning from experience and exploring prospects* (19-37). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Wintersteiner, W., Grobbauer, H., Diendorfer, G. & Reitmair-Juárez, S. (2015). *Global citizenship education: Citizenship education for globalizing societies*. Klagenfurt, Salzburg, Wien: Austrian National Commission for UNESCO.

Wood, R. & Power, C. (1987). Aspects of the competence-performance distinction: Educational, psychological and measurement issues. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Vol. 19, Nr. 5, 409-424.

Wrigley, T. (2004). 'School effectiveness': The problem of reductionism. *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 30, Nr. 2, 227-244.

Yazdanpanah, N. (2015). Pedagogy of addressivity: Peace education as evaluation. In C. Del Felice, A. Karako & A. Wisler (Eds.), *Peace education evaluation: Learning from experience and exploring prospects* (273-286). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

ANNEX I

Research Ethics
Office

Franklin Wilkes Building
5.9 Waterloo Bridge Wing
Waterloo Road
London SE18NH
Telephone: 020 7846 4301/4070/4877
reo@kcl.ac.uk



Monty Blagher

3 August 2015

Dear Monty

LRS-14/15-1290 - RBT (EdD) study on assessment of learning outcomes in peace education

I am pleased to inform you that full approval for your project has been granted by the Ed&M Research Ethics Panel

- Ethical approval is granted for a period of **one year** from 3 August 2015. You will not receive a reminder that your approval is about to lapse. It is your responsibility to apply for an extension prior to the project lapsing.
- You should report any untoward events or unforeseen ethical problems to the panel Chair, via the Research Ethics Office, within a week of occurrence. Information about the panel may be accessed at: <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/research/support/ethics/committees/ssl/rep/index.aspx>.
- If you wish to change your project or request an extension of approval, please complete and submit a Modification Request to crec-lowrisk@kcl.ac.uk. Please quote your ethics reference number, found at the top of this letter, in all correspondence with the Research Ethics Office. Details of how to complete a modification request can be found at: <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/research/support/ethics/applications/modifications.aspx>.
- All research should be conducted in accordance with the King's College London *Guidelines on Good Practice in Academic Research* available at: <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/college/policyzone/assets/files/research/good%20practice%20Sept%2009%20FINAL.pdf>.

Please note that we may, for auditing purposes, contact you to ascertain the status of your research.

We wish you every success with your research.

Best wishes,

Ed&M Research Ethics Panel REP Reviewers

ANNEX II

Dear Madam or Sir,

My name is Moritz Bilagher, and I study towards a doctoral degree in Education and Professional Studies at King's College London (for 'full disclosure', I also work as a Programme Specialist with UNESCO, at the Regional Bureau for Education in Latin America and the Caribbean). My field of research is peace education, and as I entered the final phase of study, I am about to embark on the data collection for my thesis. By means of this e-mail, I would like to invite you to take part in this.

The specific objective of my study is to understand *how achievement of learning outcomes in peace education can be assessed*. After an exploratory pilot study on teacher's views on this, for the specific case of Holocaust Education (2013), I moved into a confirmatory phase of the study and, to this end, I am looking for some level of expert consensus on the research question. After an extensive search through my personal files, bibliography, and the Internet, I consolidated a list of around 30 experts, which includes you.

The methodology I envision for this study is Delphi. This means that, if you would decide to participate, in the course of this year and first semester of the next (2016), I would contact you three more times, for different 'rounds' of Delphi. In the first round, I would send you, and the other participants, a general questionnaire, with questions on what, in your view, peace education is; what its intended outcomes are; and how they can and should be assessed.

In a second instance, I would send you a first version of a draft statement of principles on the main question, developed on the basis of the data received through the initial questionnaire, which I would ask you to review and annotate. Finally, I will send you proposed final version to which you could either subscribe; subscribe with reservations; or not subscribe to.

My hope is that such a statement of principles would be an invaluable resource for workers in the field of peace education and its assessment, to advance in evaluating programmes.

Attached to this e-mail, I send you an information sheet for you to refer to, as well as an informed consent form. If you would agree to take part I would ask you to sign and send back the informed consent form.

I will, of course, be more than happy to clarify any further aspect of this project.

I hope to hear from you, so as to know whether you are willing to participate.

With kind regards,

Moritz BILAGHER
Santiago, Chile
EdD-student King's College London
Tel. +56 9 5614 2266

ANNEX III

INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

REC Reference Number: LRS14/151290



YOU WILL BE GIVEN A COPY OF THIS INFORMATION SHEET

How to assess achievement of learning in Peace Education? Towards a 'statement of principles' by subject experts

We would like to invite you to participate in this postgraduate research project. You should only participate if you want to. Choosing not to take part will not disadvantage you in any way. Before you decide whether you want to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done, and what your participation will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully, and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask us if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information.

- Aims of the research and possible benefits

There seems to be consensus among researchers that there exists a gap in understanding how the achievement of learning outcomes in Peace Education can be assessed. The objective of this study is to take a step towards overcoming this gap, by exploring views of experts in the field of Peace Education on how this should be done. After a pilot study (2013), in which the researcher explored Holocaust Education practitioners' (i.e. teachers') views on educational assessment, at this final stage, the researcher intends to opt for a confirmatory approach. By applying the Delphi method, the researcher hopes to achieve a 'statement of principles' on what assessment in Peace Education should be like, based on subject experts' views. Hopefully, this will contribute to a greater understanding of how learning outcomes in Peace Education may be assessed.

- Who funds the project?

The research project is entirely self-funded by the doctoral researcher.

- Who is asked to participate?

The participation of subject experts in the field of Peace Education, broadly defined, is sought. This includes experts in the fields of, for example, human rights education, global citizenship education, education for sustainable development, etc. The experts may come from the academic community, but may also be (international) civil servants, educators or social leaders.

- What will happen if I agree to take part?

If you decide to participate, you will be given this information sheet to keep, and be asked to sign a consent form. After this, you will be sent a survey questionnaire by e-mail, mainly consisting of open-ended questions, and you will be asked to complete this by end of September 2015. This should take around one hour to complete. You may return this by e-mail or, if you prefer, the questionnaire can be completed through an online interview by telephone / Skype and, to the extent possible, in person. If the interview is in person, you may choose the venue for the interview to be held. If the questionnaire will be completed through an interview, it will be tape-recorded subject to your permission, and transcribed. Recordings of interviews will be deleted upon transcription. You will be sent the transcript for approval and may propose modifications, if you wish.

King's College London - Research Ethics
2012/2013/1

The research process will consist of two more 'rounds' of data collection in which you will be requested to provide feedback. After the application of the survey questionnaire, the researcher will draw a first draft of a 'statement of principles' on assessment of learning outcomes in Peace Education, which will be sent to you for your review around November 2015. You will be asked to provide comments on this statement, specifically indicating the points where you agree and disagree.

Based on a detailed review of the feedback received, the researcher will then draft a final declaration of principles on educational assessment in Peace Education, which you will most likely be sent between January and February 2016. You will then be asked to either support this declaration; support it with reservations; or not support it.

You may withdraw any data / information you have provided up until it is transcribed for use in the final report (~~that is to say~~ by 31 March 2016). A decision to withdraw at any time, or a decision not to take part, will not affect the standard of care you receive. This study will result in a report that will be publicly accessible and will contain the final statement.

- What benefits may the research entail?

The participants will be sent a copy of the study report. It is hoped that this will contribute to a greater understanding of how learning outcomes in Peace Education may be assessed.

- How will what I say be dealt with in terms of anonymity, confidentiality and data storage?

If you wish, confidentiality of information you give will be assured through anonymisation by means of which any data that could lead to your identification will be omitted or modified. Apart from the research data, some personal data will be requested, e.g. name, gender, occupation, location and educational background and age. In case you wish to participate anonymously, such personal data, such as gender, for example, will only be mentioned in the report in as far as this does not affect your anonymity. On the other hand, if you agree to be identified in the final research report, please indicate this in the consent form. As to data storage, the data of this research will be stored on a password-protected computer, which is only accessible to the researcher.

- How will the research findings be disseminated?

An article / series of articles for publication in (an) academic journal(s) may be developed on the basis of this study.

Now, it is up to you to decide whether to take part or not. However, also if you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason.

If you have any questions or require more information about this study, please contact the researcher using the following contact details:

Moritz Bilaghen
King's College London
School of Social Science and Public Policy
Department of Education and Professional Studies
Stamford Street
London SE1 8WA
United Kingdom
E-mail: moritz.bilaghen@kcl.ac.uk
Tel.: +56-9-56142266 (cellular)

If this study has harmed you in any way, you can contact King's College London using the details below for further advice and information:

Dr Gerard Lum
King's College London
School of Social Science and Public Policy
Department of Education and Professional Studies
Stamford Street
London SE1 8WA
United Kingdom
E-mail: gerard.lum@kcl.ac.uk
Tel.: +44-(0)20-78483049

ANNEX IV

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS IN RESEARCH STUDIES

Please complete this form after you have read the Information Sheet and / or listened to an explanation about the research.



Title of Study: How to assess achievement of learning in Peace Education?
Towards a 'statement of principles' by subject experts

King's College Research Ethics Committee Ref: LRS14/151290

Thank you for considering taking part in this research. The person organising the research must explain the project to you before you agree to take part. If you have any questions arising from the Information Sheet or explanation already given to you, please ask the researcher before you decide whether to join in. You will be given a copy of this Consent Form to keep and refer to at any time.

	Please tick or initial
<ul style="list-style-type: none">I understand that if I decide at any time during the research that I no longer wish to participate in this project, I can notify the researcher involved, and withdraw from it immediately without giving any reason. Furthermore, I understand that I will be able to withdraw my data up to the point of incorporation in the final study report (31 March 2016).	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">I consent to the processing of my personal information for the purposes explained to me. I understand that such information will be handled in accordance with the terms of the UK Data Protection Act 1998.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">I consent to be identified in the research report.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">I consent to being audio recorded, if applicable.	

Participant's Statement:

I _____

agree that the research project named above has been explained to me to my satisfaction and I agree to take part in the study. I have read both the notes written above and the Information Sheet about the project, and understand what the research study involves.

Signed

Date

ANNEX V

How to assess achievement of learning in Peace Education?

Towards a 'statement of principles' by subject experts

Survey questionnaire (first round)

Version 3, September 2015

Name :
Gender :
Date :
Place :

1. Can you please describe your experience in peace education?

For example:

- a. For how long have you been involved with it (if at all)?
- b. How / in what capacity?
- c. Where?
- d. If applicable: in the context of which subject(s)?

.....
.....

2. How would you define 'peace'?

.....
.....

3. How would you define peace education and/or education for peace?

.....
.....

4. How would you define the main desired learning outcomes of peace education?

In particular:

- a. Are they open-ended or can they be defined?
- b. Are they individual or collective outcomes?

.....
.....

5. In your view, what is the main objective of educational assessment?

For example:

- a. Monitoring of student achievement?
- b. Monitoring of teacher achievement?
- c. System-level monitoring?
- d. Student learning?

.....
.....

6. How do you think the achievement of learning outcomes in peace education can be assessed?

Please address:

- a. Can they be assessed like any other subject?
- b. Why or why not?

.....
.....

7. What specific considerations should be taken into account in assessing learning outcomes in peace education?

For example:

- a. In terms of assessment methods (test, essay, performance, project, other)?
- b. In terms of marking?

.....
.....

8. Is there anything else you would like to add, or would you like to share any further thoughts on this subject?

.....
.....

Thank you very much for participating in this study.

Moritz BILAGHER
King's College, London
Doctorate in Education-programme, Research-based Thesis (RBT)

ANNEX VI

On how to assess the achievement of learning outcomes in peace education

Statement of principles

Draft version 1

1. The assessment of learning outcomes in peace education is important because it helps to: (a) assess learner progress, thus creating learning opportunities for both learners and teachers; (b) assess the effectiveness of the education initiative to achieve its intended outcomes; and (c) for research purposes. The question that is critical in educational assessment *per se*, i.e. assessment of whom, for whom and with what purpose is equally relevant to assessment in peace education.
2. This area touches on four main concepts: peace; education (for peace); learning outcomes (of peace education); and assessment (of the learning outcomes of peace education), which relate to each other in the given sequential order. To describe how to assess achievement of learning outcomes in peace education, define principles to be adhered to in this and to develop a paradigm, these four concepts need to be clarified.
3. Peace is the central concept of peace education, and an understanding of this is critical to it. In this regard, both negative peace (absence of violence) and positive peace (presence of justice) are important. While positive peace is more complex to define, there is consensus that it is open-ended, rather than a utopian end-state. It can, to some extent, be equated with justice, which can, to some extent, be equated with equity.
4. This evokes the fundamental subject of peace education: inter-group peace, which, in turn implies equivalence, and thus unity in diversity. That is to say that, although human beings show a surprising range of diversity, we are equivalent as there is a One-ness underlying human existence, as per Plato's cave allegory.
5. Similarly to peace, education is open-ended. In the context of peace education, it is more than outcome; it is process, too, consisting of elements of both teaching and learning. Peace is a social construct, and requires human beings to both materialise – give- and perceive – receive - peace. Human beings are thus central to peace, and education is central to human life, or, in the words of Dewey: "Education is not preparation for life, it is life itself".
6. The outcomes of peace education should thus be human-centred, i.e. they should focus on the development of knowledge, capacities and dispositions, and not on peace itself, although this would be its ultimate objective. Peace is the 'social purpose' of peace education, not its learning outcome.
7. Peace education is about peace between groups rather than individuals, and therefore about unity in diversity in relation to group characteristics. This suggest four levels of learning outcomes of peace education:

- e. The *recognition* of self and difference;
 - f. *Knowledge* of self and others;
 - g. *Engagement* with others, that is to say, contact;
 - h. Principles of universal justice (incl. equity).
8. These levels of learning outcomes suggest different types of learning assessment. While educational assessment may become relevant only from the second level onward, no new educational assessment methodology would need to be developed for the second level as this level of learning outcomes is essentially cognitive.
 9. The third level can be assessed by verifying whether the contact has taken place, without judgements on this. However, this should be accompanied by a debriefing in the form of a dialogue, or group discussion to evaluate the experience. The focus of this should be on discussing the experience as such, without any 'right or wrong'.
 10. The fourth level may be considered the point where assessment of learning outcomes in peace education reaches its apotheosis. It should be noted that this does not simply coincide with (assessment of) moral education, but with human centred outcomes (see § 6) in relation to universal justice on the group level (see § 4, 7).
 11. This suggests the importance of culture and, therefore, intercultural communication skills, which can be assessed in a number of ways, including assessment of foreign language skills; critical reading; presentation and debating; and other non-traditional methods.
 12. Just like peace education, its assessment is process in addition to outcome, too. As the extent to which one succeeds, in peace education, is the extent to which others benefit, assessment in peace education should not be competitive. Assessment is an integral part of peace education and its methods should be ethical.
 13. Psychometrics can be used in assessment in peace education, just like in other subjects. It is recommendable to develop a *context, input, process and product* (CIPP-) model for assessment in peace education, given the importance of context and collective in relation to the individual and their achievement in this subject.
 14. Peace education relates to self and other(s) on a group level and can be perceived as a broad umbrella term, which denotes kinds of education focusing on inter-group peace. Such groups can be defined in a number of ways, including ethnic, religious and socio-economic, but also gender. This thus includes international education, religious education, civic and citizenship education and even sex education. In this sense, global citizenship education can be considered the archetypal peace education.
 15. Just like peace education has the potential to transform education, so thinking about assessment in peace education has the potential to transform thinking about assessment in general.

ANNEX VII

Statement of principles

Review register

This study seeks to develop a ‘statement of principles’ on how to assess achievement of learning outcomes in peace education through an application of Delphi methodology, consisting of three rounds:

- Round 1: The questionnaire was sent to 22 participants who had initially agreed to take part in this study, with eight questions on the topic. To this, 16 responses were received. This response was analysed using grounded theory methodology and, on this basis, a first draft version of the statement was developed.
- Round 2: This first draft statement was sent to the 16 participants who had responded to round 1. To this, a total of 9 responses – that is to say, from just over half of participants - were received by mid-December. This document creates a register for all comments, ordered by participant, first and, secondly, by comment, and records my response to them, indicating how I dealt with the comments. On this basis, a final statement was developed.
- Round 3: This final statement is sent to all participants for their: agreement; qualified agreement; or disagreement.

Grounded theory seeks to build a theory ‘from the ground’, i.e. from empirical inputs, or statements, which are formed into a coherent whole. These statements came from the participants and, in some cases, were supplemented with theoretical positions in the literature. As a consequence, and this is also a main issue in Delphi, choices had to be made between sometimes contradicting views. However, these choices are, in all cases, underpinned by argument.

I realise that these choices can lead to non-agreement with the statement, which is ultimately about assessment of the achievement of learning outcomes of peace education, rather than about peace education *per se*. By addressing each of the comments, in this register, from the overarching logic of the theory, I hope to convince the participants that the correct analytical decisions were taken, and that this ‘charter’ may prove a useful tool to help guide – or, if nothing else, continue the debate on – the assessment of learning in peace education, and possibly peace education and educational assessment itself.

Register [in alphabetical order of participants]:

#	Part.	§	Comment	Response
1	A		I would suggest one element that is at the core of peace education and thus its assessment: the idea of peace learning.	Peace learning seems to refer principally to ‘Five C’s’, i.e.: compassion, communication, cooperation, culture and conservation (source: http://peacelearningparenting.com/peace-learning/), The statement addresses four of these five C’s, and places them in an order that seeks to clarify the connection between them.
2	B	2	I think that “peace” needs to be explicitly defined somewhere, including diverse and potentially contested versions.	This is indeed the used approach: peace was initially defined in the next paragraph, 3. I have now further clarified in paragraphs 4 and 5. As this is a ‘charter’, I have not included contested versions of definition of peace, but the way the definition is reached is described in the analysis section of the thesis.
3		2	And how the results influence programming. Also how measurements of results may influence notions of peace. <i>[Reaction to: “This area touches on four main concepts: [peace]; education (for peace); learning outcomes (of peace education); and assessment (of the learning outcomes of peace education), which relate to each other in the given sequential order.”]</i>	Yes, this would be the next step. On this occasion, this has not been addressed, as the focus of the research is on how to assess achievement of learning outcomes in peace education, rather than on how to use these results. This said, some of its uses are implicit in the paragraph indicating the importance of assessment in peace education (§ 2).
4		3	Needs to be defined, I think. <i>[Reaction to: “justice”.]</i>	This initially followed the literature. However, on the basis of the received feedback, I have now revised this and clarified with a reference to main ideas from Kant, which form the basis of a large part of the theorising on justice, for example, in the work of Kohlberg.
5		4	Have you looked at the “unity theory” in peace education?	Yes, this was part of the literature review. I have also received and read your article. Thank you. In fact,

				‘unwittingly’ this declaration seems to be close in spirit to some fundamental ideas from Danesh’ unity theory, but there are also differences.
6		5	Also human systems. <i>[Reaction to: “Human beings are thus central to peace”.]</i>	I wanted to initially includes this in the new paragraph 6, in relation to the concept of mind (as: ‘mind and the realities it creates’), but as the sentence this was a reaction was no longer included in the updated version, I did not.
7		6	Do you mean aimed at the individual and her/his holistic development? <i>[Reaction to: “The outcomes of peace education should thus be human-centred”.]</i>	Yes, indeed. This idea is now moved to paragraph 9.
8		6	What about behaviors? <i>[Reaction to: “i.e. they should focus on the development of knowledge, capacities and dispositions”.]</i>	For my purpose, in line with relevant theory on educational assessment, I consider behaviour a manifestation of something (e.g. of a competence) rather than a thing in itself.
9		6	I would say that the results of individual behaviors can bring about peace. But I think that you are here implying inter-personal relationships. What about systems that perpetuate discrimination and injustice and therefore undermine peace? <i>[Reaction to: “i.e. they should focus on the development of knowledge, capacities and dispositions, and not on peace itself”.]</i>	What this paragraph addresses is that it would not be fair to hold education accountable for the establishment or not of peace. There are several ‘external’ influences that co-determine whether behaviours can lead to peace in given circumstances. The data suggest that education should educate a ‘peaceable’ learner, and should be held accountable for doing that. It is true that there is an important interaction between persons and collectives, i.e. systems, which is briefly addressed in § 14, but as the main onus in education tends to be on the learner, rather than a (political, economic, legal) system, this lead is taken here.
10		6	Many of my peace education students are interested in inner peace as a precondition for other forms of peace.	That is consistent with the charter. I have made this more explicit in the revised § 11.

			<i>[Reaction to: “Peace is the ‘social purpose’ of peace education, not its learning outcome.”]</i>	
11		7	<p>?? I don’t think so! I recommend that you get clear about the different levels of peace you might be concerned with: individual, group, system-wide</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “Peace education is about peace between groups rather than individuals”.]</i></p>	I have tried to clarify to a greater extent in § 5 and § 8.
12		7	<p>Would you here want to acknowledge the concept of identity, that it is multiple and intersecting and that it is also related to status and power (which are ingredients of the landscape for peace that individuals and groups struggle within).</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “This suggest four levels of learning outcomes of peace education:</i></p> <p><i>a. ...</i></p> <p><i>b. Knowledge of self and others”.]</i></p>	Yes, that is correct. I will add this concept (see § 10 a).
13		7	<p>I have not heard this term before “universal justice”. I suggest that you refer to common values, such as those included within the United Nations human rights framework.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “This suggest four levels of learning outcomes of peace education:</i></p> <p><i>a. ...</i></p> <p><i>b. ...</i></p> <p><i>c. ...</i></p> <p><i>d. Principles of universal justice (incl. equity).”]</i></p>	It is inspired on Kant. To clarify further, I have added a reference to the UDHR as the reference to existing UN frameworks is useful.
14		8	I don’t think this is complete. What about empathy, curiosity?	This sentence strictly refers to the first level, which relates to knowledge.

			<i>[Reaction to: “While educational assessment may become relevant only from the second level onward, no new educational assessment methodology would need to be developed for the second level as this level of learning outcomes is essentially cognitive.”]</i>	
15		12	<p>I am not sure that all forms of assessment that are competitive are anti-peace or violent, though I know that some have taken a position on this and believe that even grading is a form of violence.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “As the extent to which one succeeds, in peace education, is the extent to which others benefit, assessment in peace education should not be competitive.”]</i></p>	Interesting. I believe you are right. Sports combine competition, cooperation and fraternity. Ernst Mach also sees competition in an, ultimately, ‘fraternising’ light. I have slightly tweaked.
16		14	<p>Here again I think there needs to be added complexity about multiple identities.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “Peace education relates to self and other(s) on a group level and can be perceived as a broad umbrella term, which denotes kinds of education focusing on inter-group peace.”]</i></p>	OK, see § 10 a.
17		15	<p>How?</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “Just like peace education has the potential to transform education”.]</i></p>	By rethinking some ways in which we think about education in general – I have added.
18	C		The document looks great to me. I agree with all the listed points that were highlighted and think it can be extremely helpful to peace educators training and preparation.	Many thanks! I have slightly revised it, and hope you perceive these revisions as an improvement as I have not changed the fundamental points.
19	D		1. You rightly indicate that 'peace' and 'education for peace' (or 'peace education'?) are, in addition to 'learning outcomes' and 'assessment', key concepts that	Thank you, I agree this required further clarification. Please see the revised § 4 and § 5. I also agree that

		<p>need to be clarified. Your clarification about 'peace' did not entirely convince me, because it implies a concept that is open-ended, and that it can more or less be equated (to what extent exactly?) with justice/equity. Peace being an open-ended concept it follows that peace education will also be open-ended, as you rightly note in Principle 5.</p> <p>While, as you know, I am not a big fan of the 'negative' vs. 'positive' peace (which are misnomers I would prefer a more neutral/objective terminology, such as 'a restrictive' vs. 'an expansive' definition of peace), I also think that it could be legitimate to include both of them within the framework of your project, provided you identify clearly the distinction and provide a differentiated approach for the assessment of each one. Finally, on this point, if you decided to stick to the 'expansive' definition, you would be very close to the concept of global citizenship education.</p>	<p>GCED is central, this was reflected in § 14 and is now reflected in § 8.</p>
20		<p>2. The second general observation I would like to offer here, is that a clear definition (or clarification) of peace education or education for peace seems to be missing. I agree that it is more than outcome (i.e. that it is process too) and that it should be human-centered (I am not so sure that peace education is not about peace between individuals as opposed to peace between groups), but having a more practical definition (e.g. at all levels of education? both specific and mainstreaming approaches?) would be helpful in identifying ways of assessing the achievement of its expected outcomes.</p>	<p>I have tried to make this more concrete in § 8 and § 10. The former provides criteria of demarcation of what we could consider peace education (to avoid all types of education being grouped under this banner). The latter refers – briefly – to level of education. I believe that, read in conjunction, and with an emphasis on § 10, it should be clearer what peace education is. However, the statement is mainly intended as an overarching set of principles rather than a concrete elaboration. That would be a next step, although many existing types of education already fit the criteria of demarcation.</p>
21	E	<p>I really like the strong emphasis on inter-group peace (acceptability of diverse others, welcoming/reconciliation) as the pedagogic goal, in</p>	<p>Yes, I would agree that this is the core. Thank you.</p>

			these times of diverse societies falling apart from stresses that lean on diversity as an excuse at least. (Attached is my on-the-plane <i>ad hoc</i> diversity is dangerous chart!). The goal is to get groups to see each other within the context of ‘we are all human beings’ without us having to be attacked by aliens first...	
22		11	<p>The suggestions in paragraph 11 are oriented to ‘western’ levels of education quality and resourcing.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “This suggests the importance of culture and, therefore, intercultural communication skills, which can be assessed in a number of ways, including assessment of foreign language skills; critical reading; presentation and debating; and other non-traditional methods.”]</i></p>	I agree and don’t agree. Many children in SSA countries already speak more than one language, for example, the colonial language or, in Eastern Africa, Swahili. Presentation and debating may be more intuitive in oral than non-oral cultures. And, to provide a concrete example, Bolivia is a front-runner in Latin America in terms of multi-cultural education, while it is one of the region’s poorest countries. I do agree that, in some cases, additional resources may be required, but not in all.
23		7	<p>Without more detail, I’m not sure of the difference between 7 (a) and 7 (b). And does the ‘knowledge of self and others’ mean just cognitive knowledge? Where are empathy and the motivation to avoid prejudice and stereotyping come in here? (Motivation is the goal of peace education, not just recognition of difference and cognitive thoughts about it.)</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “This suggest four levels of learning outcomes of peace education:</i></p> <p><i>a. The recognition of self and difference;</i></p> <p><i>b. Knowledge of self and others ;</i></p> <p><i>c. ... ”]</i></p>	Yes, indeed (to the first question)! This is considered a ‘lower order’ goal, following, to some extent, Bloom’s taxonomy. The difference between ‘a’ and ‘b’ is that the former is affective and the latter is cognitive (and I would consider motivation meta-cognition). As to your second question, ultimately they would come in on the ‘highest’ level, (d) – please note these points are now moved to § 10. However, I did not want to include them as learning outcomes, because the focus would then change to moral education. The idea here is that inter-cultural communication skills inherently require an extent of ‘affective’ skills, such as empathy, because they imply some understanding of the communication partner.
24		7	‘Contact’ can easily be taken to refer to interpersonal contact in the flesh or virtually. But this is not always practicable. Any child at school meets others who are	That is what is meant – and ideally full immersion (ethnography)! The hidden agenda here is to make this practicable: ideally, in due course, large scale

		<p>slightly different –non-family members. But gender is the only guaranteed difference and that is only in mixed schools. In many locations, the students will be from the same sub-tribe or sub-clan or religious group. So what does ‘contact’ mean in this circumstance? In many situations, trips and meetings cannot practicable be arranged.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “This suggest four levels of learning outcomes of peace education:</i></p> <p><i>a. ...</i></p> <p><i>b. ...</i></p> <p><i>c. Engagement with others, that is to say, contact”.]</i></p>	<p>exchanges programmes between the ‘North’ and the ‘South’. There might not be so many resources for that now, but I hope that there will be when we consider the alternative (cultural ‘clashes’) – and many refugees are now coming to the ‘North’, that is to say, Europe and the United States anyway. Why not rather manage that? However, I have adapted point § 10 c to respond to your concern.</p>
25	7	<p>I would therefore prefer to take ‘Engagement’ to cover modalities of interaction – at a minimum, learning about and practice of cooperation, negotiation, conflict resolution (see my 5 point simplified version of the 6-12 or more point adult versions of win-win negotiation/conflict resolution), reconciliation. These modalities can be learned, even if practice has to be through role play. If contact happens naturally (e.g. in urban areas), or can be arranged, that’s another level to add on.</p>	<p>OK. Please also see response above (I have adapted point § 10 c to respond to your concern).</p>
26		<p>In conclusion, I would like to see something that asks how these ideas can relate to the various contexts in a productive way: western, eastern (ex-communist), developing country, fragile/post-conflict etc. According to earlier research, about half of conflicts will recur, so this is an urgent topic. What will be the practicalities of applying your theoretical framework? Can you suggest 4 studies/action research efforts that would test things</p>	<p>Thank you for this valuable suggestion. I think that some elements do not have to be costly – for example, turn single sex schools into mixed schools or to learn foreign languages. Other elements might meet a lot of resistance – for example, ensure representation of learners from different socio-economic strata and ethnic backgrounds in schools in western cities. While this charter focuses on the theoretical foundations of how to</p>

			<p>out? (And you know my interest in contrasting what can be done in intensive and wide coverage ways. The [name of project deleted to preserve anonymity, MB] that I initiated in 1998 had full time peace education teachers and was designed to test whether refugee educators in camp conditions could be trained and supported to do effective peace education. The 2002 evaluation by Anna Obura said Yes. But subsequent experience showed that this cannot be scaled up to country level in fragile states, where simplified approaches ‘wide coverage’ approaches (and different evaluations?) are needed.)</p>	<p>assess achievement of learning outcomes in peace education, as a follow-up engagement, it would be interesting to develop concrete projects (although there already exist several education projects fitting the definition). Some of the practicalities of the theoretical framework include that migration could become an educational project. Others could be the scaling up of teaching of indigenous languages in Latin American countries, or religious education focusing on more than one religion in the Near East and South Asia.</p>
27	F	1	<p>These are great points, but I would add... it assesses also the teacher’s methods used during materials delivery in or outside class. We cannot talk of teaching without valuing both the learner and the teacher. Even the teaching environment matters.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “The assessment of learning outcomes in peace education is important because it helps to: (a) assess learner progress, thus creating learning opportunities for both learners and teachers; (b) assess the effectiveness of the education initiative to achieve its intended outcomes; and (c) for research purposes.”]</i></p>	<p>Yes, I strengthened this (see also comment 31 below).</p>
28		3	<p>This sounds a great point. I would also suggest the use a specific and helpful method that is used to inculcate peace in the minds of the learners and its application in real life. This is a process that requires effective methods.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “Peace is the central concept of peace education, and an understanding of this is critical to it.”]</i></p>	<p>The paragraphs follow the sequence set out in § 2. § 10 Sets out in greater detail what the envisaged learning outcomes for peace education would be. On the other hand, the development of a specific method is out of scope for this specific project.</p>

29		4	<p>Good idea. So, why not include first internal peace. If we do not have notions of peace in our minds, it becomes hard for us to transfer it to others. This said, primo... internal peace or peace with oneself and then comes peace with others, including inter-group peace.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “This evokes the fundamental subject of peace education: inter-group peace, which, in turn implies equivalence, and thus unity in diversity.”]</i></p>	<p>Yes, this is now addressed in § 11. As it is arguable which comes first (‘inner’ peace or ‘outer’ peace), I indicated that the relation may be considered iterative.</p>
30		7	<p>I like this statement, though I would work on its opposite way. Peace starts with oneself, then it moves to smaller groups of people like families, and communities then spreads to wider communities and the nation. It should also be necessary to tackle the connection between peace and the ecosystem.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “Peace education is about peace between groups rather than individuals”.]</i></p>	<p>See comment above. The learning outcomes described in § 10 do not so much make a choice as to which precedes which sequentially, as emphasise the role of own and others’ identities, and how they overlap and possibly conflict, and the necessity to know and engage with them. § 11 also addresses the eco-system. This is a complex issue, but the definition of peace as per this study, as per § 4, takes this to be something that primarily occurs between human beings, and not between human beings and nature. This choice was made based on the study’s data.</p>
31	G	1	<p>This may not be a concern of all – but I think it’s important that assessments are designed in such a way that help to illuminate not just what students learned but how they learned it. This is powerful in 2 ways: 1) it can aid the learner in reflection on their learning (helping to nurture critical, reflective, ethical thinking) and 2) it can aid the educator in reflecting on their practice.</p>	<p>The proposal here is to reformulate the sub-sentence, which describes one of three main objectives of assessment of learning outcomes in peace education, to: “assess the effectiveness of the education initiative and its pedagogy to achieve its intended outcomes” [proposed addition in blue]. The other two main objectives are assessing learner progress and research.</p> <p>This is a useful addition. Curriculum usually addresses the three dimensions of content, pedagogy and assessment. The education initiative might be understood to have a pedagogical dimension in any case, but this addition will help serve as a reminder, as</p>

				education is not only its content, especially in the field of peace education.
32		1	Excellent. <i>[Reaction to: “The question that is critical in educational assessment per se, i.e. assessment of whom, for whom and with what purpose is equally relevant to assessment in peace education.”]</i>	Thank you.
33		3	Strange choice of words... maybe organic, dynamic or active? [Reaction to the words ‘open-ended’ in the sentence: “While positive peace is more complex to define, there is consensus that it is open-ended, rather than a utopian end-state.”]	<p>When positive peace is discussed, it is at times described as a utopian state. Such a utopian state, as Fukuyama describes, would represent an ‘end of history’. As this would effectively mean an end of time, and as such a closed state might take on tyrannical properties, as discussed by Popper’s in his critique on utopias in ‘The open society’, this would lead to a conundrum for peace.</p> <p>The material from some interviews offered an interesting way out; what seemed to be the case, was that peace, in essence, is a realisation of fundamental unity in diversity. Peace is the understanding that one’s ‘form’ is casual, and not of essence. This thus makes identity and diversity fundamental concepts of peace and, in practical sense, places equity – as a manifestation of justice - at the centre. In this sense, peace is not a state to be achieved but the pursuit of equity in the present. It is then not ‘closed’, but open-ended, because the state to which this pursuit will lead is not defined.</p> <p>Nevertheless, I reformulated § 4 and § 5 to make this clearer.</p>
34		4	What about internal / socio-emotional dimensions?	Yes, this is now addressed in § 11.

			<i>[Reaction to the words ‘inter-group peace’ in the sentence: “This evokes the fundamental subject of peace education: inter-group peace, which, in turn implies equivalence, and thus unity in diversity.”]</i>	
35		5	<p>Excellent.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “Similarly to peace, education is open-ended. In the context of peace education, it is more than outcome; it is process, too, consisting of elements of both teaching and learning. Peace is a social construct, and requires human beings to both materialise – give- and perceive – receive - peace. Human beings are thus central to peace, and education is central to human life, or, in the words of Dewey: “Education is not preparation for life, it is life itself”. ”]</i></p>	OK, thank you.
36		7	<p>I’m not sure I agree with this. I think I might rephrase it as “Peace education has as one of its foci and emphasis on peace between groups, and therefore...”</p> <p>There is a strong reciprocal relationship between individual relationships and collective (“group”) relationships.</p> <p>I realize it’s unlikely that many who replied to your survey take as comprehensive and holistic a view of peace education as I do.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to the words ‘peace between groups rather than individuals’ in the sentence: “Peace education is about peace between groups rather than individuals,</i></p>	<p>See also comment 11 above.</p> <p>I have tried to clarified in § 5 and § 8. The reciprocal relationships between individuals and groups is important, and discussed by Kohlberg. This is (briefly) addressed by § 14.</p>

			<i>and therefore about unity in diversity in relation to group characteristics.”]</i>	
37		7	This helps address part of my concern above. <i>[Reaction to the word ‘self’ in the sentence: “The recognition of self and difference”, mentioned as one of four levels of learning outcomes in peace education.]</i>	OK.
38		12	Excellent. <i>[Reaction to: “Just like peace education, its assessment is process in addition to outcome, too. As the extent to which one succeeds, in peace education, is the extent to which others benefit, assessment in peace education should not be competitive. Assessment is an integral part of peace education and its methods should be ethical.”]</i>	OK, thank you.
39		15	Yes. <i>[Reaction to: “Just like peace education has the potential to transform education, so thinking about assessment in peace education has the potential to transform thinking about assessment in general.”]</i>	OK.
40	H		It is an impressive catalogue of principles that you developed. A methodological hint: Grounded theory tends to avoid eventual contradictions in a set of given answers in favor of a unifying meaning. Did you find in your interviews any comments that differ evidently from the points of your synthesis?	Yes, several. The development of a coherent theory was key to this work!
41	I	1	This phrase is true in this abstract version, but this abstraction is not innocent. The question is why today assessment of learning occupies such a central place in educational reflection. I am sure it has to do with the	I am aware of your work, and I believe that your points are very important. There exists, indeed, a real threat to education as a human right across the world, as enshrined, for example, in the UDHR. However, I do not agree that educational assessment is a central

			<p>transformation of education from a human right to a strategy to form human capital.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “The assessment of learning outcomes in peace education is important because it helps to: (a) assess learner progress, thus creating learning opportunities for both learners and teachers; (b) assess the effectiveness of the education initiative to achieve its intended outcomes; and (c) for research purposes.”]</i></p>	<p>element of this threat. In fact, large scale assessments have helped to show some structural inequities, such as the central place of SES and gender, in achievement of learning outcomes. It has also shown that overall more equitable societies tend to have higher achievement on average.</p> <p>It is important to note that educational assessment is fundamentally different from intelligence testing, as it takes ‘intrinsic aptitudes’ to be but one element explaining variation in achievement scores (the New Zealand researcher Hattie has conducted a very interesting meta-analysis of this). Taking the principle of the normal distribution to apply equally across cultures, differences in achievement highlight the question: what explain these?</p>
42		1	<p>Ok, but please consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wish to know the learning outcomes is not identical to the capacity to assess. • Not all you teach (and especially the impact of the learning process) can be assessed. It would be dangerous to reduce teaching to those aspects that can be taught. • Not all teaching has a short term effect. In fact, only short-term effects are assessed by usual means of assessment <p><i>[Reaction to: “The question that is critical in educational assessment per se, i.e. assessment of whom, for whom and with what purpose is equally relevant to assessment in peace education.”]</i></p>	<p>I agree, especially with points 1 and 3. However, I believe that the right to education is not materialised until children learn, rather than ‘just’ attend schools, and this is not a given in many countries. What types of learning should occur, remains an important discussion. This study exactly aims making a realm assessable in addition to assessment of cognitive subject matters and in a way that goes beyond programme evaluation to include assessment of learning.</p>

43		4	<p>A tentative definition of the aim of peace education: To enable and empower the learners a) to behave peacefully in their own environment and b) to analyze the root causes of social violence, to understand peace strategies to overcome violence and war and to contribute to overcome the culture of violence by establishing elements of a culture of peace, in order to replace the dominating war system. Thus, peace education is ethical education, social learning and citizenship education at once.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “This evokes the fundamental subject of peace education: inter-group peace, which, in turn implies equivalence, and thus unity in diversity. That is to say that, although human beings show a surprising range of diversity, we are equivalent as there is a Oneness underlying human existence, as per Plato’s cave allegory.”]</i></p>	<p>I agree that peace education can include several of these elements. However, after analysing the data, and after the literature review, I believe that the central axis of peace education is formed by that between the self (I, identify) and other (you – singular and plural, and difference), in line with the 1996 Delors report, which was prepared for UNESCO. A peaceable learner is one who will understand, fundamentally, that group differences (in skin colour, gender, sexual orientation, religion, culture, including language and even socio-economic status) are not essential.</p> <p>If this person lives in a system that structurally oppresses these others, because they have a different skin colour, another religion or are females then something must be done. Therefore, I believe knowing the others is crucial – from all of these angles that you mention, ethically and socially.</p>
44		4	<p>You speak about the “subject” of peace education, but you do not define the task / aim of peace education. However, this is a basic condition for every assessment.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “This evokes the fundamental subject of peace education: inter-group peace, which, in turn implies equivalence, and thus unity in diversity. That is to say that, although human beings show a surprising range of diversity, we are equivalent as there is a Oneness underlying human existence, as per Plato’s cave allegory.”]</i></p>	<p>This is addressed in the following paragraphs. The statement follows the sequence of concepts of peace, peace education, peace education learning outcomes and their assessment in cascading order. The overarching objectives are described in § 2, and the specific objectives in § 10.</p>
45		5	<p>Very important and good as argument.</p>	<p>OK, thank you (both Dewey and Montessori were great teachers)!</p>

			<i>[Reaction to: “in the words of Dewey: ‘Education is not preparation for life, it is life itself’.”]</i>	
46		6	<p>Correct and important! Maybe to link to § 3.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “Peace is the ‘social purpose’ of peace education, not its learning outcome.”]</i></p>	I have reordered the points, although not directly to § 3.
47		7	<p>See my comment 4 – I think these 4 levels have to be checked against a clear definition of peace education, which one you ever choose. In my view they are much too abstract and much less too accurate, and a couple of dimensions is missing.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “This suggest four levels of learning outcomes of peace education:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. The recognition of self and difference;</i> <i>b. Knowledge of self and others;</i> <i>c. Engagement with others, that is to say, contact;</i> <i>d. Principles of universal justice (incl. equity).”]</i> 	I have reordered all points, and reformulated some key ones. I hope the reason for this particular sequence is clearer in the current version (please also see the added explanation in my e-mail).
48		7	<p>In § 6, you speak about “knowledge, capacities and dispositions” – in this list you keep only knowledge, at least dispositions are maybe hidden in c), but where are the capacities?</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “This suggest four levels of learning outcomes of peace education:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. The recognition of self and difference;</i> <i>b. Knowledge of self and others;</i> <i>c. Engagement with others, that is to say, contact;</i> <i>d. Principles of universal justice (incl. equity).”]</i> 	In ‘d’; the inter-cultural communication skills. I updated this § 10 to clarify these points.
49		8	<p>This is correct, and a clever idea. However this suggests that the addition of the four levels is peace</p>	This is an important point, but I believe language skills could be interpreted in this way. There is significant

			<p>education, which is obviously not the case. For instance, language skills § 11, is not per se a proof of “peace competence”.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “These levels of learning outcomes suggest different types of learning assessment.”]</i></p>	<p>literature on ‘language hegemony’ and ‘language and identity’, see, for example, Brock-Utne and Skattum and Woelk. UNESCO considers languages as more than a means to communicate, and a vehicle of identity and culture. As my own experience as a European having been posted several years abroad (Arab States, SSA, LAC and now North America) has shown me, learning a language – say, Arabic or Spanish – is an extremely important way to understand entire cultures, and this understanding, I believe, is a key element to achieving peace.</p>
50		11	<p>All the methods you list ARE traditional methods.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “This suggests the importance of culture and, therefore, intercultural communication skills, which can be assessed in a number of ways, including assessment of foreign language skills; critical reading; presentation and debating; and other non-traditional methods.”]</i></p>	<p>Yes, I guess that could be argued. I meant to differentiate these methods from standardised testing. I reformulated this sentence. (As an aside, it is important to note that this study focuses on educational assessment, rather than programme evaluation.)</p>
51		12	<p>Ok, but not BECAUSE it is peace education. Any educational assessment should be ethical, because education is only justified if ethical.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “Assessment is an integral part of peace education and its methods should be ethical.”]</i></p>	<p>Yes, I agree - see also the last paragraph.</p>
52		13	<p>Maybe NOT just like in other subjects. Psychometrics is good for cognitive tests with very clearly definable outcomes. This is not the case for a hybrid like peace education.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: “Psychometrics can be used in assessment in peace education, just like in other subjects.”]</i></p>	<p>I reformulated the sentence. On the application of psychometrics in peace education, learning outcomes on level ‘b’ can be clearly defined. Some elements of classical test theory could be applied to other levels as well.</p>

53		14	<p>I don't understand why you don't put this point, part of the general definition of peace education, at the very beginning, close to § 4.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: "Peace education relates to self and other(s) on a group level and can be perceived as a broad umbrella term, which denotes kinds of education focusing on inter-group peace. Such groups can be defined in a number of ways, including ethnic, religious and socio-economic, but also gender. This thus includes international education, religious education, civic and citizenship education and even sex education. In this sense, global citizenship education can be considered the archetypal peace education."]</i></p>	This is a good point, thank you. I reordered.
54		14	<p>Add human rights education, education for non-violence, for sustainable development...</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: "This thus includes international education, religious education, civic and citizenship education and even sex education."]</i></p>	I am aware that these types of education are at times grouped under the heading of peace education, but did not add, following the demarcation criteria formulated in § 8 (i.e. because these subjects do not directly relate to inter-group peace).
55		15	<p>A good idea and a good final perspective.</p> <p><i>[Reaction to: "Just like peace education has the potential to transform education, so thinking about assessment in peace education has the potential to transform thinking about assessment in general."]</i></p>	OK, thank you very much.

ANNEX VIII

Assessment of the achievement of learning outcomes in peace education

Statement of principles

1. This statement formulates principles for the assessment of learning outcomes in peace education.
2. The assessment of learning outcomes in peace education is important because it helps to: (a) assess learner progress, thus creating learning opportunities for both learners and teachers; (b) assess effectiveness of the education initiative and its pedagogy to achieve its intended outcomes; and (c) for research purposes. The question that is critical in educational assessment *per se*, i.e. assessment of whom, for whom and with what purpose is equally relevant to assessment in peace education.
3. The domain that these principles cover consists of four main concepts: peace; education (for peace); learning outcomes (of peace education); and assessment (of the learning outcomes of peace education), which relate to each other in the given sequential order. To describe how the achievement of learning outcomes in peace education can be assessed, these concepts are clarified below.
4. Peace is the central concept of peace education. While the absence of violence ('negative peace') is critical to peace, its durability can only be guaranteed by establishing 'positive peace'. Rather than a utopian end-state, this embodies the Kantian ideas that (a) every human being, as a subject of Reason, is an end in itself and (b) that one should act in such a way that one's action could be a universal law. The postulate underpinning these ideas is that of human beings' fundamental equivalence.
5. Peace is thus a type of relation between self and others, or identities. As the greatest threat to human equivalence is the idea that one (group) identity is of greater worth than another, in peace education peace is, primarily, inter-group peace. It pursues the ideal of unity - in essence and value - in diversity of appearance.
6. The concept of education is similar to that of peace, in that it is non-utopian – that is to say, it does not lead to an end state or, in the words of Dewey: "Education is not preparation for life, it is life itself". In addition, for both peace and education the human mind is central, which is where the bulwarks of peace are constructed, as per UNESCO's Constitution, and it is the focus of attention of education.
7. While there exists learning without teaching, education without learning is unthinkable. Peace education initiatives, therefore, by definition include learner engagement.
8. Thus, while peace education may operate as an umbrella term, its criteria of demarcation are that it denotes (a) learner engagement (b) in relation to identity - self and other(s) – focusing,

primarily, on inter-group peace. Groups can be defined in a number of ways, including gender, national and religious. Thus peace education includes international education, religious education and sex education. Global citizenship education (GCED) may be considered archetypal peace education.

9. As peace education focuses on identity, and on the human mind's engagement with this, its learning outcomes should be human-centred, i.e. focus on the learner's development rather than peace itself, although this is its ultimate objective. Peace is the social purpose of peace education, not its learning outcome.
10. The above suggests four levels of engagement, as per § 7 above, that may in principle take place on any educational level, with associated learning outcomes:
 - i. The *recognition* of self and difference, that is to say, of identity and identities, which are likely to be multiple, overlapping and possibly conflicting;
 - j. *Knowledge* of self and others, that is to say, knowledge of these identities (gender, national, religious and socio-economic);
 - k. *Engagement* with others, that is to say, contact with carriers of other identities, either physical or otherwise;
 - l. *Identification* with principles of universal justice (as per § 4 and 5 above), and as reflected in the UDHR, that is to say, on the assumption that communication is key to identity and identification, and that identity and Otherness are essentially cultural, the acquisition of intercultural communication skills.
11. These outcomes stand in an iterative relation with both inner peace, i.e. peace with one's self or one's identity, and peace with nature, given the symbiotic relation between human being and nature, and the extent to which this defines our identities.
12. These levels of learning outcomes are associated with types of assessment, as follows:
 - a. Assessment on this level seems irrelevant to objectives § 2 a and b;
 - b. Traditional methods for cognitive assessment;
 - c. Verification of whether the contact has taken place, accompanied by a debriefing in the form of a dialogue or group discussion, without evaluation;
 - d. Foreign language skills; critical reading and writing; presentation and debating.
13. As an integral part of peace education, its assessment should be ethical. As the extent to which one succeeds in peace education is the extent to which others benefit, assessment in peace education should treat competition with caution.
14. Psychometrics can be used in assessment in peace education. It is recommendable to develop a *context, input, process and product* (CIPP-) model for assessment in peace education, given the importance of context and collective in relation to the individual and their achievement in this subject.
15. Similarly to how peace education has the potential to transform education, so assessment in peace education has the potential to transform assessment overall, that is to say, to help reflect on how educational assessment can help achieve peace.